

No 9335. No 72



Pts. 1-5

GIVEN BY

Part 3

**INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
SAN FRANCISCO AREA—PART 3**

W. F. ...

**HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION**

DECEMBER 3, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
December 3, 1953, testimony of—	
Charles David Blodgett-----	3268
Lloyd Lehman-----	3324
Mary Pieper-----	3327
Robert E. Treuhaft-----	3329
John Delgado-----	3342
Index-----	3345

EXHIBIT

Blodgett Exhibit No. 1—Student Offensive, publication of the Midwest Student Victory Assembly, volume 1, No. 1, spring 1943 (see pp. 3273–3277).

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.
(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA—PART 3

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
San Francisco, Calif.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 9:35 a. m., in the hearing room of the board of supervisors, city hall, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig and Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; William A. Wheeler and W. Jackson Jones, investigators; and Juliette P. Joray, acting clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Before commencing today's hearings, the Chair wishes to make a brief, and we trust a clear, statement relative to demonstrations of approval or disapproval on the part of the audience. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has a charge and obligation imposed upon it by the Congress of the United States to conduct these and other hearings.

This charge the committee has not failed to fulfill in the past in spite of attacks verging upon violence on occasion. It does not intend to be swerved from its duty by organized efforts to disrupt the hearings or by demonstrations of any kind. The audience in the hearing room is not a captive audience in any sense, and those who desire to leave are free to do so at any time.

Any demonstration of approval or disapproval on the part of the audience will result in an order by the Chair for the immediate clearing of the hearing room.

It is hoped that this action will not be necessary, but the Chair will not hesitate to take whatever action is required to insure that the business of the United States Congress is conducted with dignity and expedition.

Mr. Counsel, will you call your witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. The first witness this morning is Mr. Charles David Blodgett. Mr. Blodgett, will you come forward, please?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BLODGETT. I will.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES DAVID BLODGETT

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. BLODGETT. Charles David Blodgett.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel, Mr. Blodgett?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the rule and practice of the committee which permits every witness, if he desires, to be accompanied by counsel?

Mr. BLODGETT. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. And even though not accompanied by counsel, having a right to consult counsel at any time if he so desires?

Mr. BLODGETT. I am familiar with those rules.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you desire counsel?

Mr. BLODGETT. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Blodgett?

Mr. BLODGETT. I was born on February 19, 1921, in Northfield, Minnesota.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BLODGETT. I now reside in Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever lived in San Francisco?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not in San Francisco; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived in the bay area?

Mr. BLODGETT. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what sections of the bay area have you lived?

Mr. BLODGETT. I have lived in Alameda and in Oakland.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your business or profession?

Mr. BLODGETT. At present I am employed as a salesman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. BLODGETT. I attended grammar school in my home, Northfield, Minn.; high school, graduate of Northfield High School, 1939. I then went to Carleton College.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is Carleton College located?

Mr. BLODGETT. In Northfield, Minn.; and I was graduated from Carleton in May of 1943 with a bachelor of arts degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period when you were in college and subsequent to that time were you in any branch of the military service?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I was commissioned as a probationary officer of the Navy in about August of 1942. I completed my college course in 1943 and went on active duty with the Navy July 1, 1943, so I was not on active duty while I was in college.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the Navy?

Mr. BLODGETT. I was in the Navy from July 1, 1943, until February 9, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been identified or affiliated in any manner with the Young Communist League?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you connected or affiliated with the Young Communist League?

Mr. BLODGETT. From approximately August of 1941 until I was graduated from college and went on active duty in the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you became a member of the Young Communist League while at college?

Mr. BLODGETT. While at college.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any part in organizing the Young Communist League in your college?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; I actually took the lead with the assistance of a Young Communist League organizer in establishing a branch of the YCL on the campus at Carleton College.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then a paid functionary of the Communist Party assisted you in the organization of the Young Communist League in your college?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is true, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee would be interested to know what led up to your decision to attempt to organize the Young Communist League in your college.

Would you go back and state to the committee what interested you in that course of action?

Mr. BLODGETT. One wonders how far to go. Those things I presume, start in childhood. It relates to the training, various influences, and factors in a young person's life.

I suppose most people have a conception, somewhat stereotyped, of the kind of background that makes young people join an organization like the Young Communist League, but I think an examination, for instance, of my own life and background will show that the Communists are able to reach people from all walks of life, from all types of background, good homes and poor homes, from working-class families, middle-class families.

I was born and raised in a town of 4,500 people. My father was a municipal court judge for many years in Northfield. My grandfather was a very eminent businessman in Northfield. My grandfather on my mother's side was an Episcopalian minister who was chaplain for some time at the Stillwater Penitentiary, chaplain of the senate in Minnesota for a number of years.

There is nothing particularly unusual about the way I was raised. It was a good home, 6 children; all these things may seem quite irrelevant, but I think in the record it should show somewhere that because——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Blodgett, let me assure you—and I am sure the members of the committee agree—we personally feel this is very relevant, and we are very much interested in your story. Proceed.

Mr. BLODGETT. I can remember from high school being very interested in social problems confronting the Nation and the world, and it is from that sort of background and that sort of inclination, serious minded young people, that the Communists can move in and make recruiting material.

At the age of 17 I wanted to make over the whole world into a more perfect sphere of beauty and goodness and found, at least thought I had found, the answer when I met Communists, listened to their persuasion, and although it may seem difficult to understand how this could be, let me assure you that their resources or arsenal of indoctrinating techniques have been highly refined over a period of a hundred years, and they know how to take those genuine desires of young people to make a better place for the world, make the world a better

place to live in, and take those natural inclinations and use them to reach that person and to indoctrinate them.

Now, in my own experience the first Communist I met was in approximately December of 1939, which was my freshman year at Carleton College, a small liberal arts school of about 850 enrolment. This Communist was from Minneapolis. I met him through mutual acquaintance. He got to talking with me and found out that I did have certain interests in social problems and gave me material, literature to read, books like Howard Selsam's *What Is Philosophy?* when he discovered that I was taking philosophy at Carleton College.

On the campus at Carleton there was a considerable Marxist movement among the students, which was led by a member of the faculty at Carleton.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, I noticed you said "Marxist"; you did not say "Communist." Was that deliberate on your part?

MR. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; because I think you will find this is quite typical on the campuses. A professor will be a Marxist and espouse Marxist theory while not being an organized member of the Communist Party. In this case the professor who led the movement was a refugee from Germany who said he fled from the Hitler regime and came to Carleton College as a professor of economics, very outspoken Marxist, a very erudite man, a man with tremendous intellectual agility and capacity; someone who in some other phase of endeavors, scholastic endeavor, would be considered an outstanding scholar; very glamorous figure, very dynamic figure, and he did a great deal to influence a large section of the student body, to the extent that when his contract was not renewed at the end of the year of 1939-40, the student body rose up in protest and held meetings in the college auditorium and sent a delegation to the president of the school demanding to know why this great scholar had been fired—just an indication of what kind of following he was able to achieve—and he was, of course, able to influence other members of the faculty of the college.

I became acquainted with this man—this is all prior to my joining the Young Communist League—he made his very extensive Marxist library available to me, encouraged me to do reading. I spent most of the summer of 1940 reading from his library, and there were not only Marxist works, but official Communist Party literature, *History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union*, for example, *Stalin's Principles of Leninism*.

The coincidence of meeting an avowed Communist in December of 1939 juxtaposed with the type of work that I was actually doing in the classrooms of the college. It was like an electric shock to me because here in the Communist books and philosophy I was getting practically the same basic view of history and the dynamics of history and the organization of society and the laws of society as the Marxists propounded; the Communist books and the classroom discussion met.

And this had a great influence actually on convincing me of the validity of these Marxist theories. Somehow or another the Communist Party in the Twin Cities—

MR. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "Twin Cities"?

MR. BLODGETT. That is Minneapolis and St. Paul—found out that there was a foment on the campus at Carleton College, and certain

spadework had been done, and a great deal of indoctrination had been done in the Marxist theory in the classroom and on the campus, and at that time they had imported from Brooklyn a Young Communist League organizer by the name of Harold Schachter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is S-c-h-a-c-h-t-e-r. Mr. Schachter was a very capable, extremely capable, organizer. He found out about the situation there, and through a Mrs. Meridel LeSeuer—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please spell that name?

Mr. BLODGETT. M-e-r-i-d-e-l L-e-S-e-u-e-r. Mrs. LeSeuer was the wartime chairman of the Communist Party in Minnesota.

Mr. VELDE. That is for the State of Minnesota?

Mr. BLODGETT. For the State of Minnesota; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify her further?

Mr. BLODGETT. Mrs. LeSeuer is a professional writer and a very successful writer of short stories, children's historical novels, and is still making what I understand is a very good living from her writing. She had been in attendance at Carleton by invitation of the administration of the school to conduct a panel on vocational guidance in the field of writing. I had met her for the first time in that connection, and later on, because I considered myself something of an embryonic poet, I contacted her in Minneapolis and attended a session of her short story class.

I went to her home afterwards, and Mr. Schachter, who is the YCL organizer, was present at her home. That evening I was recruited into the Young Communist League. That was in the late summer of 1941.

Mr. Schachter, getting the picture of what the situation was on the Carleton campus, worked with me in organizing the chapter of the Young Communist League at Carleton College shortly thereafter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that I not ask the witness questions about the membership of those in the Young Communist League at the college at this time. I think we can do that later, or even in executive session, if necessary, but the membership there would have little to do with our situation of the investigation we are making here.

Mr. VELDE. The suggestion of counsel is well taken, and in the interests of saving time and revealing the information that we must have in the bay area, proceed with the information that you have regarding activities of the Communist Party or any other subversive group in the bay area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blodgett, I will not ask you questions now about the identity of those who took part in this work along with you at your college. But we are interested in knowing at this time just how the Young Communist League functioned at the college and what his activities were. Will you describe those briefly for us?

Mr. BLODGETT. I think first of all it should be kept in mind that this was 1942, 1943, the early part of World War II. Mr. Schachter's organizational genius went to work immediately that we had this chapter formed. He proposed that a student conference be convened to represent as many student bodies in the Middle West as possibly could be gathered together at Carleton College. This was a very convincing example to me of the effectiveness of the Young Com-

munist League when it set out to establish a front organization to get across its program and do it still in a sub rosa manner so that very few people were actually aware that the resultant conference that was held at Carleton College in January 1943, at which there were approximately 135 student delegates from 28 Midwest colleges and universities from 6 states—Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois—very few people were aware that the YCL had any hand in this.

It worked something like this: Mr. Schachter laid out a completely detailed organizing plan to me. The first step was to establish a sponsoring committee. I went to the student body president of the Carleton College, convinced him that such a conference would be a good thing, got authorization from him to place his name upon the sponsoring committee list.

I went across the river to St. Olaf College and did the same thing with the student body president at St. Olaf. Then I had a start; I had two names of student body presidents. I went from there to the University of Minnesota, McAllister College, and that was enough. That was all that was required so we could print a letterhead, sponsoring committee, student body presidents of these four colleges. That later was printed—

Mr. TAVENNER. The purpose of that would be to show the efficacy of those people of the general plan and thereby obtain additional assistance in carrying out your original Communist Party plan?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, that is right. Well, naturally it would have been impossible for the Young Communist League to have called the conference themselves, and this made it possible. It lent it more respectability, made it possible to send out an invitation to the student bodies that would have some force and effect. It certainly proved to be true because they came from these 28 schools.

The next step was to convince the president of Carleton College that such a conference should be held on the campus. This we were able to do again because we had this committee, sponsoring committee, set up. The administrative assistant at Carleton College was invited to be the welcoming speaker. We tried to get prominent people to speak. We failed to get the caliber of speakers that we wanted, but we were able to get greetings, very warm congratulatory greetings from people like Wendell Willkie and Eleanor Roosevelt, Harold Stassen, Governor of Minnesota at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course none of those people knew that this was a Communist Party plan or a Communist Party-run assembly?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; they would have no way of knowing, and from the objectives that were set up for the conference—and apparently it was simply a conference to rally students around behind the war effort. What we wanted to achieve by it, of course, was to get across the then slogan of the Communist Party, open the second front in Europe.

In any event, we set the thing up; Schachter wrote a ream of resolutions; we had the panels organized in such a way that we had YCL members at this panel responsible for seeing that those resolutions were taken back to the general body of the convention; passed all the resolutions that we wanted, put out material, sent it around to the different schools, got publicity in the newspapers, so we achieved our purpose in any event.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this assembly known as the Midwest Student Victory Assembly?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you this publication and ask you whether or not it is a record of the assembly which you have?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; this is the official record of the Midwest Student Victory Assembly.

Most of this work was actually done by myself, preparing this booklet.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that the resolutions adopted at the assembly were prepared by Schachter, the Communist Party organizer?

Mr. BLODGETT. Young Communist League organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did those resolutions relate to?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, they related to the war, but in such a way as to get across those points that the Communist Party wished to get across, to open the second front, to abolish the poll tax; the whole line of the party at that time was contained in the body of those resolutions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Blodgett Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. VELDE. Without objection it will be admitted at this time.

(Booklet of the Midwest Student Victory Assembly publication, Student Offensive, vol. 1, No. 1, spring 1949, was received in evidence as Blodgett exhibit No. 1.)

BLODGETT EXHIBIT NO. 1

[From Student Offensive, Midwest Student Victory Assembly, vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1943, pp. 3-7]

OUR BEST IS NEEDED

The days of the greatest war activity on the part of the American people are upon us. The war has reached a turning point, but victory must still be fought for, hard, relentlessly and without complacency or overoptimism. More than ever we must fight for national unity against all defeatism, if we are to emerge from this Peoples' War truly victorious.

One of our specific roles as students is the building of national and international student solidarity. The foundation for this policy already exists. It was completed in the various pacts and agreements announced last June 11. The central thought in relation to a policy for victory and the realization of this policy is the fact that if we conduct this war as an imperialist war we are already defeated hopelessly. We will win this war only by arming and uniting all the peoples to fight for their own freedom, and victory results only by fighting this kind of war.

It is on questions of policy that we reveal our weaknesses most sharply. We seriously undertake Army welfare and USO activities but do not speak up on an issue such as the 18-year-old vote; we conduct war relief work on a broad scale but the even more essential development on international youth collaboration does not keep pace; we throw ourselves pellmell into civilian defense but are not equally vocal on vital questions of legislation and policy that affect the whole war effort.

Certainly our chief special contribution has been one of necessity, that of becoming a generation in arms. And in this war, a people's war, we are proud to be the generation which is instrumental in smashing the Fascist Axis.

But we must never forget that armaments, even overwhelming (sic) superiority in armaments, are not enough for an early victory. The African victory has offered the most recent proof of this fact, for it was not a sudden increase of arms in relation to the Axis that gave the United Nations the initiative and turned the situation in our favor. It was the policy for using the armaments, the policy of the offensive, that translated already existing armaments into military superiority over the enemy at Tunis and Bizerte.

For this reason, also, it is of prime concern to us young people who constitute the backbone of our military strength, that our services to the Nation be, at all times, guided by the correct policy which can translate armies and weapons into the guarantee of victory.

With the African successes behind us and the invasion of Europe the immediate necessity, we, as students, are willing and anxious to assume the new responsibilities which will be placed upon us in backing our Commander in Chief. By our mobilization and unification we create new opportunities to aid the war effort.

Learning from our past hesitations, we now welcome and urge the immediate opening of the second front. We continue more strenuously the fight for a centralized war economy. Realizing that too many victories are being won by the defeatists, we must participate more actively in the political and legislative struggles around such vital issues as overall planning to bring about wage stabilization, enforced price ceilings, overall rationing, rational manpower utilization. Only by actively following such a correct policy can we make our maximum contribution to victory.

JEAN EVANS, *Executive Secretary.*

THE RESOLUTIONS

The resolutions passed by the 135 delegates at the assembly in January are a remarkable achievement, a job of which we can all be proud. These resolutions are the voice of a broad cross section of Midwest college and university students. In them is expressed the greatest unity. There is no diverting factionalism here, no petty wrangling of selfish interest groups. Rather, there is unswerving allegiance to the cause of victory in the war and the peace. These two victories are as one in the resolutions.

WEAPONS

Armed with these resolutions victory is nearer, the future is brighter. We must fight for their adoption. They are worth fighting for, as victory on the battlefield is worth fighting and dying for. The battle on the home front for a correct policy, a democratic policy, is our way of showing the boys at the front that we do not intend to see military victory turned into political, economic, and moral defeat. They have charged us with this responsibility. We will not let them down.

RESOLUTION I

"We repledge our allegiance to the Commander in Chief of the United States, President Roosevelt."

This is not just a formality. We students recognize the outstanding leadership of our President. We are fully behind his decisions of policy, the Atlantic Charter, the policy of unconditional surrender made at Casablanca. But we are aware that the President is being sniped at from many sides. We have written the President letting him know that we are behind him. He needs this expression of support in warding off the attacks of those who are retarding the offensive, disuniting us in our common cause. The President's policies have often been ignored. The political fiasco in North Africa would never have come about if President Roosevelt's policy had been put into effect. We must learn from this lesson. It further strengthens the validity of our resolution. Let's back it up.

RESOLUTION II

"Realizing that victory in the war and peace is predicated upon complete unity of the United Nations and the eradication of lack of confidence and failure of common action, we urge the immediate setting up of a United Nations' War Council to function now and in the immediate postwar period with supreme military and economic power in the interest of unity of command, rational distribution of war materials, and complete confidence among the various governments."

This is a correct and farsighted resolution. A United Nations War Council does not exist. It is still a prime necessity to the winning of the war. Much of the distrust among our Allies, stemming from the Goebbels propaganda machine in Berlin in accordance with Hitler's "divide and conquer" policy, would be removed overnight if such a unity of command were put into effect immediately. Without an organized United Nations' Council we have no basis for permanent peace. We students recognize the correctness of Mr. Willkie's proposal for such

a Council, realizing that such a Council could shorten the length of the war greatly. Let us urge our friends to write Congress and the President asking for the formation of such a Council *now*. We students know that the lack of such an organization is a weapon in the hands of the Axis.

RESOLUTION III

"Recognizing the need for thorough overall planning of production and supply, manpower supply, technical and educational mobilization, economic stabilization and all other measures which might be deemed necessary to increase efficiency in the prosecution of the war effort, do resolve that some such overall planning system as proposed in the Pepper-Kilgore-Tolan bill now under consideration be enacted by Congress."

As the precondition for the opening of a second front in Europe and thus the final defeat of the Fascist Axis, production is still the most critical problem facing America. Today there is a serious production lag. We have in many cases only hesitant attempts to convert completely the Nation's industrial capacity onto a real war basis. The reason for this failure is not the lack of ingenuity; it is the lack of a plan. In certain areas we have unemployed; factories lacking sufficient raw materials must resort to laying off (sic.) men or granting them furloughs. With everything pointing to the immediate opening of a second front, we can no longer afford the luxury of piecemeal planning. Confusion in production and distribution of essential materials is used as an excuse for postponing offensive action, lengthening the war.

STABILIZATION

In speaking of production, wages must also be considered. Production problems cannot be solved until wages are stabilized and incentive rates are given for increased production. Wages and salaries must correspond to the rate of production. A very obvious result of the lack of an overall setup is the recent mine strike led by the arch-rebel, John L. Lewis. Had we had real price and wage stabilization and a clearly defined mechanism for handling such disputes, Mr. Lewis would have no basis for his traitorous action in misleading the miners. Overall rationing and price control would obviate grievances and hasten victory.

THE BILL

At our MSVA we endorsed a plan for a nationwide, overall planned economy. It is still the best solution that has been put forth for bringing some order out of the chaos of production. We students have already shown that we realize the necessity for uninterrupted and constantly extended production. It is our duty to press for the realization of this objective, the forming of a real war economy. Let's write our Congressmen asking for the passage of the Pepper-Kilgore-Tolan bill. This bill has the backing of Minnesota's Senator Ball, one of the bill's sponsors. This is a great piece of war legislation. It is worthy of our wholehearted support.

RESOLUTION IV

"The poll tax be abolished. The discrimination against racial minorities such as the Negroes in the armed services, the war effort, and in the educational systems of the United States be remedied. Definite measures be taken to alleviate the persecution of religious and other racial groups."

By May 24 the anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 7, will have been voted on in the House of Representatives. A decision will have been made. It is vitally important that the bill pass not only the House, but also the Senate. Without it America cannot become fully mobilized behind the war effort.

THE MEANING OF THE POLL TAX

This tax prevents 5 million Negroes and an equal number of whites from voting. Four-fifths of the people in the South are prevented from voicing their opinions through the ballot. One-fifth of the people of the South are permitted to control their State governments; and, furthermore, this southern minority reduces the value of the votes of people all over the United States, because it takes 5 times the number of votes to elect a Congressman from a State without the poll tax as it does to elect 1 from a State with the tax. That means the value of every vote in a poll-tax State is worth four times the vote of a man in any other State. Your vote is being controlled by a minority. Your Congressman is hampered

by a small number of undemocratically elected men. Over half of the people of the United Nations do not belong to the white race. What kind of unity can we achieve with these people when we bar 5 million of our own Negro citizens from the polls. As long as there is a poll-tax law on the books in any State, victory for the United Nations cannot be complete!

WHAT TO DO?

If your Senator in Washington does not hear from you on this bill, he may "forget" what you want. Write, and see that all your friends write your respective Senators. Demand that they be present and vote "Yes!" on the anti-poll tax bill when it comes up soon in the Senate.

RESOLUTION V

"We resolve that this war in which students are risking their lives shall result in a just and permanent peace. We realize, as do most people of this world, that such a peace is only possible when based on international cooperation, and that all citizens of the world should become citizens of a federal union of nations. Our purpose shall be: (1) to fully awaken student thought and action in the field of international cooperation (2) vigorously disseminate information * * *, (3) center student thought and action toward postwar planning."

The absence of a United Nations' War Council makes active progress in the field of international cooperation impossible. While there are hundreds of groups throughout the Nation at work discussing and discussing, the lack of a concrete framework within which to work has frustrated student efforts. That is the reason a great deal of emphasis is being placed on establishing the basic conditions for further progress in this field, pressing for the United Nations' War Council, working hard for the passage of the 18-year-old vote. Special credit for this work goes to Bill Caldwell, ex-editor of the Minnesota Daily. Bill was the framer of this resolution and led the fight in the Minnesota State Legislature for the passage of the 18-year-old vote. Bill realized that before any progress could be made in furthering the purpose of the resolution, something had to be done to give young people a voice. Along with studying the problems of the postwar world it is absolutely essential that we fight for such concrete measures to keep our perspective straight on the tasks at hand.

RESOLUTION VI

"Be it resolved that the immediate objectives of the student victory objectives of the Student Victory Assembly be: (1) Coordination of war activities on all Midwest campuses; (2) promotion of interest in and information about international cooperation."

The message and program of the MSVA has been carried to nearly all of the colleges and universities in the six immediate States. Eight communiques have been sent out as part of the task charged to the continuations committee. Although most of the time and effort expended has gone to building organizationally the committee has sponsored a program of activity designed to build up the spirit of unity necessary to win the war.

PROJECTS

During the week of March 21-28 World Youth Week was sponsored by the MSVA on the Midwest campuses with excellent results. It was the signal for Youth's Spring Offensive. Special drives were carried out on a number of campuses. A partial summary of the results of these drives are presented in the section Around the Campuses. During this week our feeling of unity with the fighting youth of the United Nations were celebrated in forums, radio skits, and discussions. We dedicated our war efforts to the struggling youth of China, Russia, England, Yugoslavia, France, Norway, Greece, Holland. On the legislative front the MSVA has pressed for the passage of the anti-poll-tax bill, the 18-year-old vote, the Pepper-Kilgore-Tolan bill, the equal-rights bill, lend-lease continuations, the Trade Agreements Act renewal and other win-the-war measures.

The MSVA has been named by ex-Governor Stassen the official organization for registering and recruiting students in Minnesota for volunteer farm labor brigades. We have urged and continue to urge every campus to engage in this project through the United States Employment Service.

This is part of what has been done. It is a start and, we believe, a good start. We must extend and expand our work. Ever greater demands are being made of us. We must meet these needs of the day with ever increasing courage and resourcefulness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other purpose of the Young Communist League in the holding of this assembly? By that I mean did it have any further purpose beyond the immediate meeting of the assembly?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, it was hoped, of course, that the assembly would continue to function. We made sure that we had key control of the continuation work of the committee, the assembly, and naturally part and parcel with any of the work that the YCL carried on in that manner it was hoped that it would strengthen the Young Communist League; that it would impress other students on the campuses so that where personal contacts were made between YCL members and other students, it could be pointed out to them that this is the Young Communist League in action; this is what the Young Communist League does, and use it as a basis for assisting in the recruiting program of the Young Communist League, and it did have a great deal of effect on students at Carleton College, for example, who might have hesitated to even be interested in the Young Communist League.

We were able to follow that up after the assembly and establish closer relationships with some of these other student contacts and bring some of them into the YCL.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this also used as a method of expanding the influence of the Young Communist League into other colleges and on other campuses?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, yes, it was. However, it could only be done in a very indirect way because at Carleton and the University of Minnesota—those were the only 2 schools of the 28 where there were Young Communist League chapters, so the influence on the other schools would be more of an indirect nature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive the cooperation of any college with the knowledge on the part of the participants from the college that this was a Young Communist League enterprise?

Mr. BLODGETT. I think only in the case of the University of Minnesota delegation was there any real awareness of who was behind this whole assembly. In fact, the president of the student body of the University of Minnesota, or somebody, once said, "I know who you are, but I will go along with you in any event because the war is on, and we will cooperate."

But when they got to the assembly and found how stacked the resolutions were, the dean of students at the University of Minnesota did his best to try to head some of the resolutions off, but he was overwhelmed because it was too well organized in advance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I introduce this evidence in order to demonstrate this is a perfect example of the formation of a Communist-front organization and a most successful one.

You have stated that upon your graduation you went on active duty with the Navy.

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you went on active duty did you retain any active Communist Party membership?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I did not. I don't think we have in the record yet the fact that I did join the Communist Party about March of 1943. When I went on active duty in the Navy, prior to that time, I was instructed to turn in my membership card as a matter of party policy at the time.

Mr. VELDE. When was it that you entered the Navy?

Mr. BLODGETT. It was July 1, 1943.

Mr. VELDE. Were you an officer in the Navy?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. VELDE. What was your rank?

Mr. BLODGETT. Ensign.

Mr. SCHERER. Who instructed you to turn in your Communist Party card, Mr. Blodgett?

Mr. BLODGETT. The secretary of the Communist Party of Minnesota, Mr. Martin Mackie, M-a-c-k-i-e.

Mr. SCHERER. With what group did you hold your membership at the time you went into the party?

Mr. BLODGETT. I was a member at large. I was not affiliated with any club or chapter of the party.

Mr. SCHERER. And who issued you your Communist Party card at the time, do you recall?

Mr. BLODGETT. As I recall, it was a Mr. Robert Kelly.

Mr. SCHERER. What position did he hold with the party?

Mr. BLODGETT. I am a little vague on that point. I think he was the chairman of the party at that time in Minnesota.

Mr. SCHERER. You said the turning in of your Communist Party card when you went into the service was in accordance with the policy of the party at that time?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; as I understood it, I was instructed that this was the policy of the party, that all members take a leave of absence while they were on active duty in the armed services.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that there is considerable testimony by previous witnesses which indicates that that was the hard and fast policy of the party at that time, that individual party members entering the service were in fact required to turn in their party cards.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this of the witness: Even though you turned in your card, that didn't turn you out of the party, did it?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; it took the form of a leave of absence, temporary leave of absence.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, but you continued in the heart and spirit and mind of a Communist.

Mr. BLODGETT. Very definitely; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Even though you turned in your card?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been recognized as constituting a military leave as it has sometimes been described?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, at this time were you a member of the Communist Party as distinguished from the Young Communist League?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; I was, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Communist Party. Where did you become a member of the Communist Party, and what were the circumstances?

MR. BLODGETT. I joined the Communist Party at a party convention which was held in Minneapolis in approximately March of 1943. I was one of two Young Communist League members who were to be honored by the party, invited to join the parent group.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what you did after being discharged from the Navy?

May I delay the answer to that question for the moment? During the time you were engaged in military service, did you observe any Communist Party activity on the part of any individual?

MR. BLODGETT. No, no—

MR. TAVENNER. By that I mean any individual in the Armed Forces.

MR. BLODGETT. No organized activity as such. I made personal contacts with people who were sympathetic, but there would be no way of knowing whether they were organized in the party in any way. The question was not raised, but from time to time one would meet someone in the armed services who was sympathetic and interested, and Communists know who another Communist is from just talking to them. You had certain language characteristics, a certain jargon, a certain way of explaining, approaching, different questions that made it possible to identify each other without coming right out and saying, "I am a member of the Communist Party."

So I did on 1 or 2 occasions meet people while I was on active duty in the armed services. No Communist Party business was discussed; there was no organized activity.

MR. JACKSON. Did any of the individuals to whom you make reference identify themselves to you as members of the Communist Party?

MR. BLODGETT. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. On your discharge from the Navy did you return to your home in Minnesota?

MR. BLODGETT. Very briefly for a visit, and I moved myself and my family to California.

MR. VELDE. When were you discharged from the Navy?

MR. BLODGETT. Well, the actual day of discharge was February 9, 1946. However, I was processed in December. The discrepancy there is terminal leave time.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in coming to California at that time?

MR. BLODGETT. My purpose was to attend the California Labor School on Market Street in San Francisco.

MR. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you made your decision to attend that particular school?

MR. BLODGETT. I had heard about the school and understood that it was accredited for the Veterans' Administration, the GI bill of rights and educational program, through personal acquaintances. One of them had preceded me to the school, and it looked like the sort of thing I was looking for at the time, and since it could be accomplished under the GI bill of rights, I decided that ought to be my first step in civilian life, to attend the California Labor School as a full-time veteran student.

Mr. JACKSON. What would be the date of your entry in the school?

Mr. BLODGETT. Approximately the middle of February 1946.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Counsel, what was the date, if you can make it available, of the citation of the California Labor School?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; it was on June 1, 1948.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the California Labor School was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as an expanded Communist Party institution for the purpose of disseminating Communist propaganda; it was opened in San Francisco in the summer of 1944 to replace the Tom Mooney Labor School; denounced as Communist controlled by the California State Federation of Labor.

Mr. VELDE. Actually the Federal Government, the taxpayers, were paying for your education at the California Labor School; is that right?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct, sir. They also provided me with a library of Marxist literature.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know when the California Labor School was taken off the list of approved schools under the GI bill of rights?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. JACKSON. I think for the purpose of the record that date should be determined, however. See, Mr. Counsel, if that can be done.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is my recollection that we have received testimony from other sources showing that it was during the year 1948 that the situation resulted in stopping the subsidy to that school through the application of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner, can we have any information as to the number of veterans that were subsidized in this school by the Federal Government?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe this witness would be in a position to state the number while he was there. I do not believe that there are any statistics as to the total who attended the school under the GI bill of rights, at least I do not recall it.

Mr. SCHERER. Do I understand it was over a 4-year period that this subsidization took place?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not think it began as early as 1944. May I ask the witness the question if he knows when the first students under the GI bill of rights attended the California Labor School?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, except that I know there was a group in attendance under the full-time veterans' program prior to my matriculating into the California Labor School. In February there were six.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I think certainly that the published hearings covering the testimony of this witness should carry as a footnote or as an appendix the information relative to the total number of GI's who attended the California Labor School if it is possible that the staff could obtain that information and put it in the hearings at this point.

Mr. VELDE. Yes, I believe that is satisfactory. It is agreed that we authorize our staff to go into such an investigation to determine the number of students who attended the California Labor School under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. DOYLE. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that notation show the number of students who attended from the time of its opening until

it was cited by the Attorney General as a Communist front. It might show the number of American boys that were under the Communist Party influence directly before it was discovered it was a Communist front.

In other words, it was cited June 1, 1948: How many students attended before June 1, 1948.

Mr. VELDE. Your suggestion is well taken, Mr. Doyle, and the committee staff is directed or authorized to make that determination.¹

Mr. SCHIERER. I think also, Mr. Chairman, this observation should be made for the purpose of the record: We know it is true that the citations have been made in 1948, the citations for activities in the preceding years.

Mr. VELDE. Yes, certainly; there is no question about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blodgett, how many students were in attendance at the California Labor School under the GI bill of rights during the period that you were there?

Mr. BLODGETT. I could only approximate the number; probably 30 to 40 full-time, regular students in the program while I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there others who were there on a part-time basis?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; that is my understanding.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of your attendance at that school?

Mr. BLODGETT. From late February 1946 until the early part of September of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the qualifications for admission to that school in addition to being a member of the Armed Forces or a veteran of the Armed Forces?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, basically that was the qualification, a certificate of eligibility under the GI bill of rights. That is, it was open to all veterans.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, those who had no Communist Party affiliations could attend this school?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of your attendance at that school did you ascertain whether there were very many GI's who were former Communist members in attendance at the school or whether they were for the most part non-Communist when they entered the school?

Mr. BLODGETT. It would be very difficult to say, to have any way of placing any of them in the party directly except by the views that they expressed and the kind of reception they made to the instruction that was given.

All you could do was make assumptions as to that because there was no organization of the Communist Party at the school of the students.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I will ask you at this time to describe the functioning of that school to the committee to give it as complete a history of operations as you can during the period you were there.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

¹ Information received from the Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration at San Francisco, Calif., indicates that a total of 388 veterans were enrolled at California Labor School under provisions of Public Law 346 during period of approval by State authorities which was October 8, 1945, to July 27, 1947.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I haven't too much direct knowledge on the history of the school. I was there for a matter of 6 months, became acquainted with a certain number of instructors and administrative officers of the school and my fellow students at the school, and I could tell you what the courses were that I took and who most of the teachers were from whom I took instruction. Aside from that I could throw very little light on the organization of the school or any of its parent ties to the Communist Party.

The full-time students took a set of basic courses which ran for approximately the 6-month period, at which time they were given a certificate of having completed that course.

We took courses in American history, American trade-union history, trade-union theory of practice, labor journalism, Marxism, world politics, creative writing, public speaking, parliamentary procedure, courses of that nature, and I did obtain a very concentrated knowledge of Marxist approach to the trade-union movement, for example, having attended that school, a very rigorous course of study in Marxism, basic Marxist fundamentals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given Marxist reading courses?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, Marxism I and II were two of the courses that were offered. Mrs. Hazel Grossman was the instructor. We used Karl Marx's Capitalism as a basic textbook.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you study the history of communism in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BLODGETT. I did not at the California Labor School; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had studied that before?

Mr. BLODGETT. I had.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were a Young Communist?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other instructors in that school while you were there?

Mr. BLODGETT. Dr Holland Roberts, who was administrator of the school and instructor in history; Jules Carson taught a course in labor journalism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this: If you know of your own knowledge whether any of these instructors were members of the Communist Party, I think you should state so, and if you have no knowledge, you should state so, as you name these individuals.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, in the case of Jules Carson I can't say that I attended a Communist Party meeting with Mr. Carson, but he did confide in several of the students that he had attended the Lenin Institute in Moscow some years ago, and I would presume one would have to be an organized Communist to be eligible for admission to that school.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where Jules Carson is now?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. VELDE. When was the last time that you saw him?

Mr. BLODGETT. I would say approximately 1948.

Mr. DOYLE. You said he confided to several students. Did he confide to you?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I am sorry I didn't make that point.

The only other member of the faculty of the school I could place in a Communist Party meeting was Dr. Holland Roberts. That

meeting took place in 1949 at the home of Adam Lapin in San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the last name again?

Mr. BLODGETT. Lapin, L-a-p-i-n, associate editor of the Daily People's World at the time I was in the party in California.

The other instructors were Leon Alexander, Isobel Cerney, Irwin Elber.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isobel who?

Mr. BODGETT. Cerney, C-e-r-n-e-y. I said Irwin Elber. Hazel Grossman. Those were the principal instructors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any Communist Party activities during the period you were in attendance at the school there?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I did. I rejoined the party in approximately April of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you rejoined the party?

Mr. BLODGETT. I was visited by Lloyd Lehman, who at that time was the Alameda County chairman of the Communist Party.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry; I didn't get the name, Mr. Blodgett.

Mr. BLODGETT. Lloyd Lehman, L-e-h-m-a-n. Mr. Lehman had been apprised of the fact, through someone else, that I had been a member of the YCL and the Communist Party prior to my entry into active service in the Navy, and he invited me to rejoin the Communist Party in Alameda County, which I did at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to a group or unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; I was residing at that time in the Encinal, E-n-c-i-n-a-l, housing project in the city of Alameda, where there was an active club of the Communist Party, which took the name of the housing project, the Encinal Club of the Communist Party, and I became a member of that club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any position at any time in that club as an officer?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I was chairman of that club the latter part of 1946 and all of 1947, literally appointed by Mr. Lehman to that post.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of the students at the California Labor School members of this group or unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. Only one, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his name?

Mr. BLODGETT. Wayne Hultgren.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell it, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. H-u-l-t-g-r-e-n. The one recruit that I was credited with during my entire tenure in the Communist Party was recruited at the California Labor School, and subsequently he became chairman of the Encinal Club. His name was Clarence Davis. We had that in common, that we were students at the California Labor School and members of the Encinal Club of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many members were there in this club?

Mr. BLODGETT. The membership varied. I would say from a high of 70 members to a low of approximately 35 members. The club was split up. Approximately at the same time I became chairman it was

split into 2 additional clubs, the Estuary Club, which was located in Estuary Federal housing project in Alameda, and a city club composed of members who resided in the city proper of Alameda, with a top membership of 70 to about 35 members.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have asked you to note the names of all of those that you can definitely recall as those whose names you are positive were members of either of those particular groups. I wish you would tell the committee, please, who the members were.

Mr. BLODGETT. Wayne Hultgren, Ruth Hultgren, Jack Standish, Ruth Standish—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Will you read them a little more slowly, please, and again, if you can identify any subsequent activity of the individual in the Communist Party, or if you can identify them by occupation, I wish you would do so.

Mr. BLODGETT. I will attempt to. Wayne Hultgren, who became chairman of the Alameda section of the Communist Party which was comprised of 4 clubs. Ruth Hultgren, his wife—

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you, had you known that individual before entering the armed services?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; Wayne was a fellow student, a classmate of mine at Carleton College and was a member of the YCL at Carleton.

Ruth Hultgren, his wife, was also a Carleton College graduate, but did not join the YCL on the college campus. Jack Standish; his wife, Ruth Standish; whereabouts or occupation unknown to me.

Ora Kelly; Mrs. Ora Kelly, Aram Attarian, A-t-t-a-r-i-a-n, who later became a member of the City Club, his wife, Sally Attarian; Mr. Newton Hill; his wife, Pearl Hill. Mr. Hill was a plasterer. Al Brown, later dropped out of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I would like to ask you to state, wherever you have knowledge that an individual has withdrawn from the party, to so state.

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I will. Al Brown was chairman of the club prior to my becoming chairman of the Encinal Club. He later dropped out.

Mr. JACKSON. What was his occupation, if you know?

Mr. BLODGETT. I do not recall, sir. I know that he worked in the Bethlehem Shipyards. The Encinal Club of the Communist Party grew out of a strike at the Bethlehem Shipyards. I do not have direct, firsthand knowledge of that, so I am not trying to cover something I am not too familiar with, but Mr. Lehman, in giving me a brief history of the growth in the city of Alameda of the party, indicated that this club grew out of a strike at the Bethlehem Shipyards in Alameda and was composed mostly of Negroes who were employed at the shipyard.

Sidney Claibourne, C-l-a-i-b-o-u-r-n-e; his wife, Ethel Claibourne. I do not know the occupation. Clarence Davis who has been mentioned previously in my testimony, became chairman of the club in 1948 and was a fellow student at the California Labor School and was employed as a laborer as a member of the Laborers' Union, A. F. of L.; Shelly Davis, his wife; Charles Blacklock, who became chairman of the City Club of Alameda and was an electrician by trade; Robert Dwinnell, D-w-i-n-n-e-l-l, occupation unknown; Kenneth Roberts; Vera Roberts, his wife; Mrs. Fanny Lehman, wife of Lloyd Lehman, who was a section official, Alameda section official;

Mr. Luther Morris, who at one time was the business agent of the A. F. of L. Steamfitters' Union, employed at Bethlehem Shipyards; Eugene Parker, also employed at Bethlehem Shipyards at that time; and Mr. Frank Franks, F-r-a-n-k-s; Mrs. Carmen Melia, M-e-l-i-a; Will Campbell, C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l; Walter Kirkon, K-i-r-k-o-n, carpenter; Ernest Cook, C-o-o-k; John Smith: Ernest Boykin——

Mr. JACKSON. Can you further identify John Smith before the committee?

Mr. BLODGETT. I appreciate the difficulty there. No, sir, except that he was a Negro. I don't know what his occupation was. He lived in the Encinal housing project.

Mr. JACKSON. Approximately what age would he have been?

Mr. BLODGETT. Thirty-five.

Mr. JACKSON. About 35 at that time?

Mr. BLODGETT. At that time. Ernest Boykin, Bethlehem Shipyards employee who lived in the Encinal project; James Lewis, L-e-w-i-s; his wife, Veda Lewis, who resided in the Webster housing project which lay between the Encinal and Estuary housing projects, occupation unknown. Joe Terry; his wife, Opal Terry, who were also in the Webster housing project; a Mrs. Maddox, M-a-d-d-o-x, lived in the Estuary project and became a member of the Estuary Club; Mr. Albert Legard, L-e-g-a-r-d, who was an official of the Estuary Club of the Communist Party; Mr. Cleveland Hearn, H-e-a-r-n, became chairman of the Estuary Club of the Communist Party; his wife, Inez Hearn; and Mr. Lloyd Lehman, who was Alameda County member, chairman of the party, and member of the Estuary Club.

Those are all the names that I can recall.

Mr. JACKSON. Those were all individuals known to you personally to have been members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct, sir.

Mr. VELDE. At this point the committee will take a recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 10:39 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:49 a. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 11:02 a. m.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blodgett, how long were you a member of the Communist Party cell which you have just described?

Mr. BLODGETT. I believe your reference is to the Encinal Club?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BLODGETT. Of the Communist Party. I was a member of the Encinal Club from approximately April 1946 to November 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you have occasion to become acquainted with functionaries of the Communist Party on a higher level; that is, State and county or section level?

Mr. BLODGETT. As a club chairman, of course, I was in attendance regularly at section executive meetings comprised of the various officers of the four clubs which made up the Alameda section of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the names of the four clubs which made up the Alameda section of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. The Encinal Club, the Estuary Club, City Club, and the William Z. Foster Club, which was composed of members working

in the steel industry. The steel industry was the concentration industry for the Alameda section, so although the members of the William Z. Foster Club resided throughout Alameda County, that club was a part of the Alameda section to further the concentration work of the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the numerical strength of the clubs other than your own, if you know? Or the approximate strength?

Mr. BLODGETT. I would say the approximate membership of the Alameda section was about 100; that is, the 4 clubs, the total of the 4 clubs. The Encinal Club was the largest of the four.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a professional club or group of the Communist Party in Alameda County?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; there was a professional section of the party in Alameda County. I know very little about it because by nature of the organization of that section other members of the party—very few of them knew who those members were. They were pretty well underground.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, you will recall the testimony of Mr. Harold Ashe before this committee in which he described the purpose of the formation of professional groups or clubs of the Communist Party, and the purpose being to protect and to secure the identity of the members of the professions, even from other Communist Party members. Was that plan maintained in this area?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, to the best of the ability of the party in Alameda County that same plan was adopted for the professional section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the chairmen of the respective clubs with whom you met in section meetings from time to time between 1946 and November 1948?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, of course I was chairman of the Encinal Club, I identified Mr. Blacklock as chairman of the City Club and Mr. Cleveland Hearn as chairman of the Estuary Club, and Mr. Don McLeod as chairman of the Austin Club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you spell it, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. I am not too sure of the spelling. I believe it is M-c-L-e-o-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the county chairman of the Communist Party during that period of time from 1946 to 1948, or were there more than one during that period?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; as best I can recall, Mr. Lehman was chairman of the Communist Party of Alameda County throughout my membership in that body.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to come in contact with members of the Communist Party on a higher level than that which you have described?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, through my association and employment by the Daily People's World as East Bay reporter I met with higher bodies of the party in Alameda County.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think at this point we should go back to the time that you terminated your training at the workers' school. Will you tell the committee, please, what your next work or assignment was?

Mr. BLODGETT. Through the assistance of the labor school I was placed on the staff of the Daily People's World as East Bay reporter in approximately, well, September of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your duties with that paper?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, my official title was staff writer. Of course, I covered a narrow segment of news in the East Bay.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Could you give us more information about the Daily People's World? I, of course, have no knowledge of that newspaper myself. Is it a Communist newspaper, and could you give us some information about it?

Mr. BLODGETT. It is not an official organ of the Communist Party, Mr. Moulder. However, it does hew to the line of the party very religiously, and for all intents and purposes it is a Communist organ, while not an official organ of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this at this point?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. You said through the assistance of the people at the labor school you obtained this position. Who at the labor school got you that position? I mean who specifically.

Mr. BLODGETT. It was Mr. Jules Carson who taught the course in labor journalism at the California Labor School, and he suggested to the staff of the People's World to give me a tryout on the paper, and at that particular time a vacancy developed in the East Bay, and I was hired to fill that vacancy.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed with the paper?

Mr. BLODGETT. From September of 1946 until October 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, who constituted the staff of the Daily People's World during the period you were employed by it?

Mr. BLODGETT. Mr. Al Richmond, of course, was the executive editor of the Daily People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you a moment. In identifying those employed by the Daily People's World, will you state whether or not you knew them to be members of the Communist Party, and if you name those that you did not know to be members of the Communist Party, will you also so state that fact? In other words, give us all the information you can about those who were members of that staff and the extent of their participation, if any existed, in Communist Party activities.

Mr. BLODGETT. To the best of my knowledge, all members of the editorial department of Daily People's World and the business office were members of the Communist Party. That was a prerequisite for employment.

Mr. JACKSON. That was a must, was it not?

Mr. BLODGETT. That was a must, yes. I can further substantiate that by the fact that we did hold regular meetings of the staff, both editorial and business, which were conducted as Communist Party educational meetings, and members of the State executive board of the party were often in attendance, giving the staff the line, strategy, and tactics of the party to be applied by the party.

Mr. JACKSON. That is to say, it was a closed meeting; the State commander of the American Legion or a member of this committee would have a hard time getting in?

Mr. BLODGETT. It would necessarily be a closed meeting. Mr. Al Richmond, who was executive editor; Mr. Adam Lapin, L-a-p-i-n, who was the associate editor; Doug Ward, who at one time——

Mr. TAVENNER. Douglas Ward?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I only knew him as Doug Ward. I presume it was Douglas. Ward was political editor for a time. Mr. Lee Coe, C-o-e, was labor editor. Mr. Steve Murdock, who worked on the copy desk and was feature editor, magazine editor; Mr. Louis Green, who was slot man on the copy desk; Ralph Izzard, I-z-z-a-r-d, who was a staff writer; Miss Jane Gilbert, reporter; Pele Edises, E-d-i-s-e-s, was the artist of the newspaper; Mr. Mason Roberson, R-o-b-e-r-s-o-n, a columnist for the paper; Mrs. Eva Lapin, L-a-p-i-n, was a staff writer, reporter.

In the business office was Mr. Harry Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r, business manager; Mr. Leo Baroway, B-a-r-o-w-a-y, circulation manager. There were other people who did clerical work in the business office, including Mrs. Helen Lima, L-i-m-a; Mrs. Juanita Wheeler, W-h-e-e-l-e-r. There was a Sid Partridge who did circulation work for the paper. Barbara Bick, B-i-c-k, was the librarian; Norman Canright was the feature editor, C-a-n-r-i-g-h-t. His wife, Marjorie Canright, was a librarian.

I probably have forgotten a few of the names and have not included them in the list. It is pretty general information who were the staff members of the newspaper.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe to the committee, please, how that paper functioned, to what extent the Communist Party influenced the editorial policy and the reporting of news by that paper and any other matters showing the effect of the control of the Communist Party upon that paper from your own experience while working for it?

In other words, give us a word description of the operation of that paper from the Communist Party standpoint as nearly as you can out of your own experience.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, as a preliminary statement on that, of course it should be understood that the Communist Party considers a daily newspaper, if possible, a weekly newspaper, some type of newspaper, as absolutely indispensable for the purposes of the party, not only for dissemination of propaganda, but actually to give guidance to members. It is a "must."

I mean, that is classical Leninist theory on the role of the press. You must have a newspaper. Now, as I said before, attempts were made to make it appear, at least, that the Daily People's World was not an official organ of the party. In other words, the party would disavow responsibility for the contents of the paper, and if the party wants to use the paper for official announcements, those announcements made over the signature of some official of the party. In that way, that is the distinction between the Daily People's World and the Daily Worker, for example, in New York, which is an official organ of the Communist Party, and the connection is made there very directly, and there is no question about it.

There are peculiar reasons for this different type of arrangement in California which goes into the whole political history of the region. The Daily People's World has always had a larger non-Communist

leadership than the Daily Worker, and that is the reason for making that rather transparent separation between the paper and the party, but when the staff of the paper met, and William Schneiderman, who was the chairman of the party of California, or Celeste Strack, who was State official of the party, or Archie Brown, State official of the party, or Mr. Lehman, state official of the party, was in attendance at that meeting and was giving us the line of the party as it should be applied in the press, then it becomes pretty obvious that the Communist Party considers the Daily People's World its own and directs what the contents shall be, what kind of coverage there shall be, and the editorial policies.

In my own experience, of course, in Oakland where I had an office at 1723 Webster Street, down the hall from the Communist Party office in the same building, I was very often given specific instructions by the county chairman, Mr. Lehman, as to what my activities should be as far as my work as a reporter for the Daily People's World. I think that covers the basic question related to between the party and the press.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the freedom of the press the Communist Party talks about so much, of which they are such great defenders when it comes to the activities of other newspapers? That was actually direction of the press, was it not?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, yes, it was very specific direction on just what the contents should be and what type—

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, the Communist Party in effect writes the Daily People's World?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, certainly.

Mr. JACKSON. Was the Daily People's World serviced by a national news-gathering service of any kind?

Mr. BLODGETT. They had United Press wire service.

Mr. JACKSON. But there was no specific news-gathering service nationally for the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not to my knowledge; no. I mean, I worked in Oakland and East Bay, and I was not involved in the actual putting out of the newspaper, sources of news and—

Mr. JACKSON. The Daily Worker, the Michigan Worker, the Daily People's World, and so forth.

Mr. BLODGETT. They subscribed to the Federated Press and other news services.

Mr. JACKSON. These newspapers are actually used for sending down to all levels of the party the directives of the Communist International, is that correct?

Mr. BLODGETT. Ultimately, yes; although the connection becomes a little tenuous at points, ultimately that is true.

Mr. JACKSON. Whatever the Soviet foreign policy happens to be from day to day with its right-angle turns and somersaults and reversals. Was it rather difficult for you as a writer on the paper to keep up with these sharp turns, and what did you do, for instance, when an occasion came along like the Duclos letter, which caught everyone off stride? What position did the paper take immediately? Or did it wait for instructions as to what position to take?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I was on the staff of the paper at the time of the Duclos letter.

Mr. JACKSON. I mention that only as an example. Were you there during any of the right angle turns?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, it was no great problem for me because, as I say, I was not an editor in the newspaper. When there was a change in the line as to how to apply the party's program, we simply held a meeting, and I was told what the new line would be.

Actually my work on the newspaper was that as a reporter, not as editor. Although I can give you an answer, it wouldn't be from direct knowledge.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I understand that. Looking back to your own experience, the Soviet party line was dictated in Moscow, would in turn be picked up by the Communist Daily Worker, and then within the space of time necessary to transmit that news to the other Communist organs or transparencies, let us say, that line would then be picked up as the official party line?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct. We did use the Worker as our model as far as what to emphasize in the news.

Mr. JACKSON. And the membership of the clubs and branches were expected to follow the line that was laid down in the local Communist organ as representing the official position of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not it was the policy of the management of this paper to report facts accurately or to report incidents that occurred in such a way as to work out to the advantage of the Communist Party or to aid the Communist Party in some issue that it was endeavoring to raise?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, this was a matter of natural course. As an organ which was a semiofficial organ of the Communist Party and a propaganda medium, of course editorial policy is dictated by interests. It is true of other newspapers as well, but it was carried out very much to a fine point with a newspaper like the Daily People's World. It involved me in all kinds of difficulties with my conscience at times, let me put it that way.

I would write a story, for example—this is relatively insignificant, but it is symptomatic of what goes on. I would write a story about an open-air meeting, say, on the campus at Berkeley. My estimate of the gathering, the size of the crowd, might be 400 or 500 people, and I would so state in the news story. When I saw it in print that number might be 2,000 or 5,000. I was not even consulted on it.

Why? Well, because the Communist press must take any manifestation of support for a Communist cause or a Communist-sponsored cause and blow it up, make it appear a great deal more, exaggerated, out of proportion.

Why? Simply to generate a whole movement behind that particular issue. We did that. You can do that simply on how you estimate the size of a crowd at a gathering. Maybe it was a Wallace meeting; the students were gathered on the campus.

Mr. DOYLE. That is a deliberate misrepresentation of fact to the reading public.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, that is true, Mr. Doyle, but the role of the Communist press is not necessarily to adhere strictly to facts. It certainly was not in the case of this, as you can see.

That was not the sort of thing that annoyed me the most. There were other things which annoyed me much more, errors of omission, commission, in the work that I did myself; things that I had to write that I couldn't stomach.

If the committee is interested in some of those actual incidents, I would be happy to go into them.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Doyle, we have seen that same thing happen with reference to accounts of the hearings of this committee when they are published in the Daily Worker. You can't recognize them as having—

Mr. DOYLE. I realize that, Mr. Scherer, but it certainly is a terrible thing to have it stated here. I mean, it is good to have the fact, whatever it is, but it is certainly shocking to realize that the American public is getting habitually a deliberate misrepresentation of fact. That certainly is a fraud on the public either in this paper or any other publication, deliberately lies. You can't call it less than deliberately lying in my book.

Mr. JACKSON. The section of the American public that reads the Daily Worker and thinks it is getting the truth, I think, is probably very, very minute in any case. I doubt much that there is any considerable amount of misleading done.

Mr. DOYLE. But, Mr. Jackson, this witness has stated that the reason that this paper followed the policy it does, of having its editorial policy as it is, is because, as I understood him to testify, this paper has more non-Communist readers than the other papers.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; that is true.

Mr. DOYLE. In that case it is exceedingly more dangerous.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blodgett, I think the committee would be interested in knowing the manner and the extent to which this paper attempted to color incidents which you no doubt have in mind. You referred to certain incidents. I think you should state to the committee what they are.

Mr. BLODGETT. I can recall several actual stories that I worked on which were stories in which I was very directly involved, in which I had a sympathetic interest as well, not just as a reporter, but as a person.

I can recall, for instance, the case of the Vallejo Navy employee by the name of Ernest Hall. Word came to us that Ernest Hall was a victim of an attempted lynching by the father of a 13-year old white girl. She had accused Hall of attempted rape, and on the identity of the girl shortly after the alleged incident occurred, the father did take measures into his own hand.

That was brought out in the subsequent court trial of Hall.

On the basis of Hall's story when I interviewed him in jail in Solano County, I assumed that he was telling the truth. This again goes back to the Communist approach toward intersocial relationships among the peoples of various groups in this country.

If a Negro was accused of something, and there was any doubt at all about it, the Negro is right. Now, I am not saying this because I have any anti-Negro feeling. I never have, and I never will. We are all God's children. But you can go overboard on something like that, and it is dangerous, very dangerous, and it became so apparent to me as the case developed and unfolded, as the post-trial developments unfolded.

But I wrote blazing stories in the *Daily People's World* about this man who had been nearly lynched and the false accusations of this white girl who had a grudge—the 13-year-old girl who was supposed to have a grudge against this man and made up this story; tried to get him into trouble.

During the court proceedings in Solano County the girl was on the stand. That was the first time I began to have some doubts about the position that I had taken and that the *Daily People's World* had taken and the Communist Party had taken and the Civil Rights Congress had taken. It was one of the most concentrated defense efforts that the party in the Bay area certainly put on in all the time I was in the party in Alameda County. A great deal was stirred up. The Negro population of Vallejo was stirred up; a chapter of the Civil Rights Congress was forming down there, all kinds of activities. Bail money was raised to get him out of jail.

When I heard the story of the girl, I began to have doubts. I mean, if she were a highly imaginative child, she might possibly have made up the story, but it just was incredible that she could have. Still we took this tack: Hall was not lynched, it was an attempted lynching. He was bruised from this episode with the girl's father.

He had good defense; excellent defense. The courtroom was packed by a mixed group of Negro and white people who were supplied by the Civil Rights Congress, actually taken to this little town in Solano County from East Bay to be there in that courtroom to influence the outcome of the trial, to influence the jury—not by applause, but by smiles, things like that, so it became obvious to the jury that the sympathies of the audience were with the defendant.

While the Civil Rights Congress would never admit that was a tactic, the tactic is to pack that courtroom so it will indicate support for the defendant.

It was a hung jury, and Hall—two hung juries. There were two trials. The case was finally dismissed, and it was a great victory supposedly for the rights of the Negro people and a great victory for the Civil Rights Congress, and I was praised for my role in it.

Now, we had encouraged this man, Ernest Hall, to bring felonious assault charges against the girl's father. That would be the natural thing to do, although he was not convicted. The case was dismissed because of two hung juries, so it was set on the calendar.

Mr. Hall did not show up to press this felonious assault charge. There was nothing in the *Daily People's World* about this. Subsequently Mr. Hall was arrested and put in prison on felonious assault charges brought against him by his wife. His wife had stood by him very loyally and worked hard and actually had gotten up before groups of people and spoken about her husband, never having spoken before a group of people in her life. She stood by him all through the trials, and within a matter of a few months after Hall's case was dismissed in court, he was arrested because of felonious assault charges brought by his wife.

Now, it doesn't prove that Hall was guilty at the outset, but it certainly did raise doubts, and the *Daily People's World*, you know, in all honesty as a newspaper should report these facts, and I knew that I couldn't. If I did carry my doubts in print in the *Daily People's World*, I would be subjected to charges of white chauvinism, put on trial and run out of the party for it.

That is to me a very good example of the lack of morality as far as reporting the news is concerned that I had to engage in as a reporter for the *Daily People's World*.

There were other cases. There is the whole story of supposed police brutality in Oakland against Negro people, which the party and the *Daily People's World* hug close to their chests.

You see, they were supposedly interested in stopping this sort of thing from going on in Oakland. I was certainly interested in it, and I am convinced to this day that there were actual cases of police brutality in Oakland. There were individuals on the police force—the police department knew this; they were aware of it. Well, when you go to the county hospital, jail hospital, and see a man who has had his bladder ruptured, caused by a severe blow, and all the circumstances involved point to an incident of brutality, everyone in this audience would be concerned about it; you wouldn't want it to happen; you don't like that sort of thing to happen.

I was genuinely concerned about it. But now the Communist Party and the Civil Rights Congress, the *Daily People's World* take up something like this. They make it their own issue. Why? To stop police brutality? The Communist Party cannot stop police brutality. They would go directly to the chief of police; the *Daily People's World* would make demands on the chief of police of Oakland. Could the chief of police do anything on the basis of the demands made by the Communist Party without acceding to the Communist Party? Without surrendering to them? The result of it would be actually to encourage the Communist Party. Of course he could not.

But the Communists hug those things so close to their chest that nothing could have been accomplished. The chief of police at that time was Lester J. Devine. He had just taken over from a man named Tracy, and he had inherited most of these series of incidents that the party was making so much fuss about.

I went in, and I had an interview with Mr. Devine, a young, intelligent, very efficient and well trained police administrator, and I spent probably an hour or hour and a half with him, and he told me what the police department was going to do about it, what his plans were, what he could do, what he couldn't do, and when I left that interview, as a reporter for the *Daily People's World* I was convinced that that man was absolutely sincere, and what do you do in a case like that? Well, of course, you try to encourage this, if you are interested in stopping police brutality.

So I reported this to the party, to Lloyd Lehman, the chairman, my editor. Their point was that the man has not acceded to the demands, and therefore let us raise the slogan of "Fire chief of police of Oakland." This was supposedly a campaign to get rid of police brutality, but this became the slogan, to fire Chief of Police Devine and to label him party to the murder of innocent people.

Now, that is exactly the language that was used—murder. A young policeman, admittedly without training, shoots and kills a Negro. I attended the coroner's inquest. This man maybe had no business handling a gun; wasn't trained properly to make an arrest; but he was no murderer. He was no murderer.

So the Communist Party cries "murder," you see, and the police department, of course, responds. How can the police department

respond and something actually be accomplished to rid them of incompetents if the Communist Party hugs this thing so close? So, I mean, it was so apparent at this point that the Communist Party was interested in what? Recruits for the Communist Party and readers for the Daily People's World. They were not interested in stopping and preventing further incidents of police brutality.

Now, if I had raised that question in the party, I couldn't do it; I absolutely couldn't. Could I write stories like that for the Daily People's World that Chief of Police Lester Devine was actually trying to do something? No, I could not. It was morally debasing to me to be put in that position, and it was one of the factors of course—one among many—which caused me to become completely disaffected with the party newspaper.

Mr. SCHERER. These charges of police brutality were made all over the country a few years ago. We had a similar situation in Cincinnati where a series of charges against the police department were made along the line about which you have just testified.

Investigation followed, and it was conclusively proven that the negatives of films taken of persons alleged to have been beaten by the police were tampered with, so that when those pictures were published in a left-wing paper—it showed stripes, presumably from police clubs on the victim's back—when the original negative was obtained, it was proven, as I say, that they were put there when published, so I know that those things do exist.

Mr. BLODGETT. This is one of the most popular issues the Communists have, attacking the police department.

Mr. VELDE. In fact they attack all authority, all persons in authority, in order to destroy the form of government under which we operate; isn't that true?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is true, of course.

Mr. JACKSON. As long as there is constituted authority, the chances of the creation of the proletariat state is made increasingly difficult, is it not, under constitutional forms where you do have elected officials, where you have a free ballot, where you have a free press, where those things exist: Is there not a constant drive against the very things which make it possible for the party to operate today in the manner in which it operates?

Mr. BLODGETT. Oh, for my own part I would agree with that statement.

Mr. JACKSON. How long, in your opinion, would there be a free press in this country if the Communist Party ever came to power?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, if you mean by a "free press" the freedom to print and put out a newspaper—

Mr. JACKSON. I mean freedom to print the facts objectively and honestly.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, in answer, when the Communist Party takes over control—I mean in the pattern of revolution—it becomes a dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communists say that. Dictatorship of the proletariat means complete control of all production, including the production of news, of newspapers.

Mr. JACKSON. Isn't it accurate to say that out of your own experience you were told what to write; how to write it; to put aside any moral scruples; to put aside your conscience in the interest of the directives of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. It was more oblique than that. If somebody had come to me and told me, "Put aside your morals and the way we tell you to," no, they couldn't get anybody to work for them. It is not that direct a thing. It is done obliquely; it is done by inference and implication and approval when one does exaggerate the size of the crowd and this sort of thing, you see.

It doesn't have to be done by direct order.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, it is accomplished, in any event.

Mr. BLODGETT. It is accomplished in any event, certainly. I mean, in the first place, a newspaper like the Daily People's World—how much news can they cover? Just by completely ignoring news, which physical limitations of the paper dictate, they cannot give their readers any news of actually what is going on; only hit those things which the party knows are important to its own program. So to call it a newspaper, as such, is probably a misnomer. It is a propaganda organ; it is an organ for actually directing both the Communist movement and giving instruction to the fringe of the Communist movement. In fact, that is where it is very effective, especially for the People's World more so than the Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that in performance of your duties as a reporter for the Daily People's World that you were given directions from the chairman of the Communist Party of Alameda County, Lloyd Lehman, as to how you should perform your duties as a reporter. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, although this is not systematic. Whenever Mr. Lehman thought that a certain activity of the party should be covered, then he would tell me to do that. We would collaborate on editorials, for instance. He would instruct me to draft an editorial on a certain subject which would appear over his signature, or he would write an editorial and want me to go over it and smooth it out, so we worked on it in that way, so there was a direct linkage between the East Bay editorial staff of the Daily People's World and myself and the chairman of the Communist Party of Alameda County, Mr. Lehman.

Mr. TAVENNER. During all this period of time you were a member of the club or cell of the Communist Party which you described at an earlier part of your testimony?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part while employed by the Daily People's World in any particular activity of the Communist Party outside of the publication field?

Mr. BLODGETT. Oh, yes. Unlike most working reporters—I hesitate to say that I was one because I am afraid the members of the press would snicker about that—a staff member of the Daily People's World being a member of the working press. But I was required to speak at meetings of the party for raising funds for the Daily People's World. It was 16-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week job, and of course I was required to be familiar with sources of news as they developed in Alameda County that were of left-wing nature, and for that reason and in the capacity as reporter for the Daily People's World I sat in on meetings of the Alameda County Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, before going into that subject, I believe this would be a convenient place for a break, because that will take rather a long time.

Mr. VELDE. All right. At this time, before we recess for the noon hour, I would like to thank the various people who have written and sent wires to this committee congratulating it on the work it is doing here in San Francisco.

The committee will be in recess for an hour and a half. We will reconvene at 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:40 p. m. of the same day, the hearing was resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, and Clyde Doyle.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will please be in order.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES DAVID BLODGETT—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blodgett, at the close of your testimony this morning you mentioned the fact that you had knowledge of the existence of a committee of the Communist Party known as the political affairs committee, am I correct in that?

Mr. BODGETT. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you tell the committee, please, what the function of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party was?

Mr. BLODGETT. The Political Affairs Committee of Alameda County of the Communist Party was a key committee of the party as far as all political activity in the county is concerned. It was not a policy-making body of the party at which members were elected, but it was charged with the responsibility of actually carrying out the line of the party in every phase of the party's work in Alameda County, whether it was during election campaign, the influencing of the selection of candidates, the influencing of swinging support of trade unions to certain candidates, raising of funds for political campaigns, Communist Party campaigns, Independent Progressive Party campaigns, and in some instances where Democratic Party candidates were supported, the actual arranging of support for those candidates.

They brought together the key people as far as the functioning of the Communist Party is concerned in all its front activities with representatives on the committee from trade unions, from Negro organizations, Independent Progressive Party.

I was not a member of the committee but sat in on meetings as an observer for the Daily People's World so that I would know what was developing politically in the county for story material.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you receive information as to the time and place of the meetings of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. My notifications were directly from the chairman of the Alameda County Communist Party, Mr. Lehman, who was, however, not chairman of this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. In referring to Mr. Lehman, is that Mr. Lloyd Lehman?

Mr. BLODGETT. Mr. Lloyd Lehman. I sat in meetings of this committee over a period of approximately 2½ years. Those meetings were held as often as twice a week, depending upon the tempo of activity in the county or as seldom perhaps as once every 3 weeks. But throughout this entire period, 2 or 2½ years, I sat as observer on that committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any security arrangements made regarding the secrecy of the meetings?

Mr. BLODGETT. More than I encountered anywhere else in my activities with the party. Meetings were shifted around; they were held at private homes; attempts were made not to have any two consecutive meetings at the same home, but the meetings were held in the daytime; cars were parked at some distance away from the home, and so on. If members of the committee were seen about to enter the place, you would wait until they had gone in before you approached the place of the meeting.

This was, of course, to protect certain members who should not be seen and could not afford to be seen with known Communist Party officials.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that the chairman of Alameda County Communist Party was not the chairman of this committee.

Who was the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BLODGETT. The chairman of the committee was Mrs. Mary Pieper, Berkeley housewife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. P-i-e-p-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other persons who held the position of chairman of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party in addition to the person you just mentioned?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not while I sat in on those meetings. Mrs. Pieper was chairman throughout that period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee what the general composition of the committee was?

Mr. BLODGETT. The committee was composed normally of Mrs. Pieper, who made arrangements for the meetings, handled notifications, set up an agenda for the meeting; Mr. Lehman, Lloyd Lehman, county chairman of the party; Mr. Wesley Bodkin, who was county organizational secretary of the party, who would quite likely be in attendance; Mr. Carroll Barnes, who was also secretary of the party of Alameda County; Mr. George Edwards, who was chairman of the west Oakland section of the party, so that one or more of those top party officials was always present.

There were also trade union people, key people in trade unions in the East Bay: Mr. Paul Heide of the Warehousemen's Union, Local 6, vice president at that time, was in quite regular attendance at those meetings; his wife, Mrs. Ruby Heide, as well: Mr. Goodman Brudney, who was with the CIO public workers, attended quite frequently, as did Mr. Bernard Young.

Mr. VELDE. Will you spell the name of Brudney?

Mr. BLODGETT. B-r-u-d-n-e-y. Goodman is his first name, G-o-o-d-m-a-n; the CIO council secretary, Paul Schlipf, S-c-h-l-i-p-f, and his successor, Mr. Ole Fagerhaugh, F-a-g-e-r-h-a-u-g-h, and his successor.

Mr. Paul Chown, C-h-o-w-n. One of those gentlemen of the CIO council secretary was almost always present at those meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me; were these persons that you mentioned all members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. These were closed meetings of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. These were closed meetings?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe you said greater secrecy and security was attached to these meetings than almost any other meetings or functions of the party that you attended.

Mr. BLODGETT. That I attended, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your attendance at these meetings. You described it in a general way, but can you particularize it more definitely?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, in general, as I said, merely as an observer; I had no voice in the affairs of the committee. I did work with the committee in providing them with information which they did not have access to, which I did, or could go out and get for them on which they could base their judgments on political candidates and political races.

Aside from that, merely as an observer for the Daily People's World, so I would know what story material was developing in the county.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you would know what?

Mr. BLODGETT. What story material was developing or in the process of being developed and would be able to cover it properly in the Daily People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings of that organization did you attend in your 21½ years in which you were in attendance on this committee?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, that would be very hard to say. They were, as I said, during crucial periods of election campaigns held very frequently. It could be held as many as 2 or 3 times a week. Then we would go without a meeting for several weeks, periods of less activity. Over a period of 2 years it probably was upwards of a hundred meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that these meetings were held in the homes of various members of the committee. Can you name the homes in which the committee met?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I can recall very definitely five homes that at one time or another housed the meeting of the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. At which you were present?

Mr. BLODGETT. At which I was present, that is correct. Meetings were held in Mrs. Pieper's home in Berkeley; in the home of Kathleen Griffin, who was also very active in the affairs of the committee, also in Berkeley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this: In giving the names of these people in whose homes the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party met, would you, in giving their names, also give any other definite information that you have of your own knowledge regarding the Communist Party activity affairs, if you know?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir. Kathleen Griffin's home is also in Berkeley, near the Oakland border. We met in the home of John Delgado.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. D-e-l-g-a-d-o, who also served on the committee in his capacity as official of the Progressive Citizens of America. We met at the home of Paul Chown in east Oakland. At that time Mr. Chown was secretary of the Alameda County CIO Council; and we met at the home of Gordon Williams, also in east Oakland in the hills. Mr. Williams was very active in the affairs of the committee. He was the East Bay director of the California Labor School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with his wife?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; at least on 1 or 2 occasions his wife, Joy Williams, was at those meetings, not as a member of the committee, but she was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee at this point a bird's-eye picture of what transpired normally at these meetings, and what length of time did the meetings usually consume; any information that you can give the committee about the character of these meetings is desired.

Mr. BLODGETT. These meetings usually lasted from 2 hours to all day on into the night and come back the next day and meet because you might be coming close to the deadline for filing of a candidate for political office, and attempts were made to get the right candidate, and of course there were divergences of opinion on this among the members of the committee, and committee members had to take assignments of arranging for contacts to be made with potential candidates through some mutual party so that they could be encouraged to file, particularly true for somebody the committee would have liked to have seen run as a Democratic Party candidate. Endless discussion around these questions and the details of working out these campaigns can be very, very difficult, as all you gentlemen know. That was the high point of the political activity of the committee.

They did direct the general activity of the party and organization, push the party influence or control as far as putting the Independent Progressive Party on the ballot. They were responsible for conducting those campaigns in Alameda County for working out the petition campaign, obtaining signatures to qualify the Independent Progressive Party for the ballot, a meeting generally of that nature of key importance. Following the so-called Oakland general strike, for instance, in 1946, end of the year, there was a tremendous amount of political foment in the city of Oakland, and the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party was instrumental with the springboard from which a joint labor committee, Alameda County Joint Labor Committee, was established, a committee composed of representatives from the A. F. of L. and CIO unions, and that committee was successful in the Oakland city election campaign of electing 4 out of 5 of the candidates that they had placed on the ballot.

Some of those candidates were actually selected in the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Blodgett, how were the people who attended these meetings notified, if you know?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, my notification, Mr. Velde—and that is the only thing I have any firsthand knowledge of—was directly from Mr. Lehman.

Mr. VELDE. By telephone or by card?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; directly. Our offices were right down the hall from one another, and he would tell me if a meeting was scheduled. How the other notifications were made, I do not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any incident where Communist Party members were criticized or disciplined in any manner at one of these meetings for failure to properly carry out Communist Party directives?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, I was given quite a demonstration of the technique of what the party called self-criticism at a series of meetings which were held in the home of Paul Chown, before mentioned, in east Oakland, and the person under criticism was Kathleen Griffin, who at that time was secretary of the Alameda County Joint Labor Committee, and Miss Griffin had come under considerable criticism.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that?

Mr. BLODGETT. Miss Griffin had come under considerable criticism from the party officials for failing to carry out directives of the Political Affairs Committee, and as I say, it was a very interesting experience for me to sit through this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify the persons who were present or some of them who were present on that occasion?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, because it was a rather key committee, a key committee politically, the joint labor committee, and a great deal of concern about it, we had pretty full meetings, as I recall, during those criticism sessions with Miss Griffin.

I remember Bertram Edises was present on one occasion. Of course I have a very definite recollection of that because he more or less assumed the role of defense attorney for Miss Griffin, which was quite unheard of in party circles.

When one is subjected to criticism, it is assumed that because one is subjected to criticism, that criticism is justified. That is the assumption at the outset.

Then the problem for the person who is under criticism is to dig into himself and find out, "What is wrong inside of me, with my political thinking, that could allow me to have made that error or to have failed to carry out that directive?" And that is the procedure that those criticism sessions are supposed to take. That person is supposed to acknowledge the mistake, find out why that mistake was made and make a pledge that it would not happen again and take steps to make sure it doesn't happen again.

On this particular occasion Mr. Edises, as I say it was a rather unusual thing, actually got up and accused the party leadership of subjecting Miss Griffin to an unjustified attack and so on and so forth. That is why I remember that very definitely on that occasion.

Mr. Chown was there, of course; Mr. Heide, I believe. There were invited into the meeting officers of the professional section of the party, because Miss Griffin was a member of the professional section in her clubs, and they were invited in to take part in these criticism sessions. She had not actually been brought upon charges, and I don't know whether she ever was. That is something else again. This was preliminary to that if she did not respond properly to that cathartic treatment.

I remember Herschel Alexander was present. He was east Bay director of the Civil Rights Congress. John Morgan was present.

John Morgan was an official at one time, at least; was business agent of the CIO Steelworkers' Union, a local of it, in the east Bay.

Mr. VELDE. Did you give the approximate date of this meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, it was late in the summer, I presume, of 1949, as close as I could place it.

Mr. MOULDER. In what year?

Mr. BLODGETT. 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having seen Mr. Edises at more than one meeting of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes. Mr. Edises, of course, was assigned by the party to work with the Civil Rights Congress in the east Bay, and in that capacity and in other capacities did attend meetings of the Political Affairs Committee, as well as did Mr. Robert Treuhaft, his law partner. Mr. Treuhaft was in attendance at those meetings on occasions.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did Mr. Treuhaft attend these meetings, if you know?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not with great frequency, but he was in attendance at meetings of the Political Affairs Committee; I could not say off-hand how many.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you can recall that any of these individuals whom you have mentioned took any particular part in these meetings, I would like you to tell the committee about it. You have described what occurred in this one meeting in which Mr. Edises expressed himself in regard to Miss Griffin. Now, can you recall any other instances where individuals took an active part in the meetings?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, let me describe a meeting preparatory to becoming involved in an election campaign, for example. I can recall that in, oh, early 1948. This was the year that the Independent Progressive Party became qualified for the ballot, where Henry Wallace was the national standard bearer of the third party movement.

We had a series of emergency meetings revolving around the congressional district, as I recall, where it apparently would be necessary for the party to become involved to more or less influence the political content of the campaign of the Democratic candidate, George P. Miller, who was running for Congress at the time. That was in the 6th Congressional District which included Contra Costa and parts of Alameda County. There were a series of meetings, emergency meetings, held around the problems of that campaign, in which Communist Party leaders from Contra Costa County had to be called in because there was an overlapping between the 2 counties in that Congressional district and had to be consulted because the political campaign affected the party in both Contra Costa and Alameda Counties.

One of those meetings was held at the Williams' home in east Oakland. I have a very definite recollection of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you fix the approximate date?

Mr. BLODGETT. Before filing deadline, 1948. That is about all I can say; before the primaries. I know it must have been pretty close to that because they were emergency meetings.

Mr. VELDE. Can the gentlemen from California—

Mr. JACKSON. By the "final deadline" you mean the deadline for the filing of nominating petitions?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. What is the date of that, if you know, either of you?

Mr. JACKSON. I defer to Mr. Doyle. I think it varies. I don't think it is a fixed date any year, but generally I should imagine it is about a month before or 2 months before the actual primary election.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, early in April.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that is the case. It would be in March or April, I think.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, that is about the only way I could fix the time of the meeting, with relationship to the filing of the nominating petition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall definitely who were present at the meeting to which you have just referred?

Mr. BLODGETT. I can give a pretty close approximation. I don't think I could name everyone who was there and make sure that that person was there that particular night.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the names of those that you are positive in your own mind were there, and in doing that, state, as you did before, what connection, if any, they had in the Communist Party other than the attendance at this meeting, if you know.

Mr. BLODGETT. As I recall, the representatives from the Contra Costa party were—officials of the party, were—

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "party"?

Mr. BLODGETT. The Communist Party—were Cleophas Brown—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the first name again?

Mr. BLODGETT. C-l-e-o-p-h-a-s Brown, Mildred Bowen, B-o-w-e-n. Our committee as regularly constituted was there, I would say almost 100 percent turnout—Mrs. Pieper, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Bodkin, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Paul Heide, John Morgan, Mr. Chown, Miss Griffin, Mr. Gordon Williams, Mr. Edises or Mr. Trenhaft—I remember one of them was represented there.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are not certain which one?

Mr. BLODGETT. I am not certain right now which one it was. I think Mr. Trenhaft, and another member of that law firm, Mr. Robert L. Condon, was present because it was a very special emergency meeting; something had to be done promptly to get the question settled, and he was called in also to be consulted on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any further circumstances about that meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, except that I think some conclusion was reached at that meeting as to what action should be taken; resulted, I think, in the filing of a candidate in the Democratic primary—cross filed in the Independent Progressive Party, which actually opposed Mr. Miller in the election campaign. That candidate, as I recall, was Mr. Luther Morris, M-o-r-r-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated Mr. Robert L. Condon was one of those who attended this meeting. Did he attend any other meeting of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party to your knowledge?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; that was the only meeting at which he was in attendance. Mr. Condon, of course, resided in Contra Costa County. Whether he attended meetings in Contra Costa County I do not

know, but as I said, this was an emergency meeting where officials, party members of both parties were involved in discussions, probably because it did affect both counties.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever meet in a Communist meeting with Mr. Condon on any other occasion other than this one time that you have mentioned?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, I have never been at another Communist Party meeting with Mr. Condon. I was a little surprised to see him there frankly because he was a candidate for office himself, and I thought it was rather risky to have him there because it was a closed meeting of the Communist Party members; it had to be. I, of course, had known him before in my work as a reporter for the Daily People's World, had interviewed him as a candidate, and worked with him when he was a defense attorney, for instance, for Wesley Bodkin and Walter Green, who were two Communist Party officials brought to trial in Emeryville, Calif., on a public disturbance charge, using the loudspeaker without permit.

Mr. Condon defended them, and at that instance I worked with him because I was covering it for the Daily People's World. I knew him very well because of course I was in the office, the law office, of Edises, Treuhart, and Condon on numerous occasions to get story information for the Daily People's World.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you on the occasion of this meeting have an opportunity to have any conversation with Mr. Condon?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir, I did not. I actually did not take part in those meetings. I just sat there as—

Mr. JACKSON. I mean just a social interchange.

Mr. BLODGETT. Oh, probably greeted him; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you express any surprise at his presence?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not overtly; no. I was surprised.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the business on which that meeting was engaged finally terminated at that particular meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. As I recall, the matter was settled at that time; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had there been more than one meeting on the subject?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, there had been more than one meeting.

I recall another meeting at the home of Kathleen Griffin on the same subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. From your testimony, that means it must have been held prior to the holding of the one you have just described?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify with any further particularity the holding of the prior meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, except that it was conclusive. I remember definitely Mr. Cleophas Brown was there, and Louise Todd, who was the State official of the Communist Party, was present.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, this question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Did I understand you to say that at this meeting it was decided to put in a candidate against the candidacy of George Miller?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And they did put in the candidate against him; did they?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, although there was disagreement on the committee, as I recall, about whether it should or should not be done. The purpose of doing that was—that is not an uncommon thing—from the party's point of view George P. Miller sort of slipped away; he was not someone they could have any influence over whatsoever any more, so to force him to take a position a little closer to that of the party's on certain issues, they would run this candidate—I suppose a typical practice you would run into in other places—who will be a left candidate and will appeal to that segment of voters who would otherwise probably vote for George Miller.

It was a pressure group to get him to take a more leftist position.

Mr. DOYLE. As a matter of fact, in that election generally in California the Communist Party did that, didn't they? Put in candidates against what they figured were more or less liberal candidates that they couldn't control or have any influence over?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, I think that became part of the significance of the Independent Progressive Party, its role in election campaigns.

Mr. DOYLE. You mentioned Mr. Condon, and you have made it clear that you knew him well. Did he participate in the meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. Oh, yes, of course.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I don't remember what position he did take.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you were surprised to see him there, so no doubt you took notice of what part he took in the meeting. That would be logical for you to do, wouldn't it?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes. Well, I say yes. I couldn't quote the man, what he said. Generally I recall that his position was that the party should not run a candidate against George P. Miller. At that time Mr. Condon was, well—he collaborated in this political campaign with George Miller, Jr., of Contra Costa County, was teamed up with him pretty much; George Miller, Jr., running for the State Senate, and Mr. Condon, as I recall, took the position that a third party candidate posing as a Democrat should not be placed in opposition to George P. Miller.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of any other persons who attended meetings of the Political Affairs Committee, persons whose names you have not already given?

Mr. BLODGETT. I really don't know whose names I have given already. I have, at your suggestion, made a list of those I could remember.

I think I named Mrs. Mary Pieper who was chairman; Lloyd Lehman; Wesley Bodkin; Herschel Alexander.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Will you identify Herschel Alexander?

Mr. BLODGETT. I mentioned him previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you have.

Mr. BLODGETT. He was Civil Rights Congress organization secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BLODGETT. Paul Chown, whom I identified; Paul Heide, also identified; Ruby Heide, his wife; Paul Schlipf I mentioned; Lyn Hames, H-a-m-e-s, was with the CIO utility workers; Ole Fager-

haugh I mentioned; Barney Young; Goodman Brudner; John Bittman I did not mention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell that, please.

Mr. BLODGETT. B-i-t-t-m-a-n. He was an international representative for the United Electrical Workers Union and was a candidate for office, assembly. Sandra Martin, who was business agent of CIO United Electrical Workers Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. M-a-r-t-i-n. Joseph Melia, who was secretary of the Alameda County Independent Progressive Party organizing committee; John Delgado whom I mentioned in connection with a meeting in his home. He was secretary of the Progressive Citizens of America. Rose Segure, S-e-g-u-r-e, who was also associated with PCA; Kathleen Griffin I mentioned; George Edwards; Louise Todd, who was a State official of the party; Ralph Johnson, who was in charge of the petition campaign for the Independent Progressive Party in Berkeley; Allen Johnson, who was with the A. F. of L. Carpenters Union; Bertram Edises; Robert Treuhart; Cleophas Brown, mentioned; Mildred Bowen, county; Gordon Williams; and John Morgan; that is the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. John who?

Mr. BLODGETT. Morgan, also mentioned.

Mr. VELDE. Who was John Morgan, Mr. Blodgett?

Mr. BLODGETT. At the time I knew him he was with the CIO Steelworkers' Union as a business agent. That was a local, although I don't recall the number. I think it was 1304, machinists local. He has been mentioned in previous testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any instance during the 21½ years of your attendance upon the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party when a person other than a member of the Communist Party was invited to it?

Mr. BLODGETT. Not to my knowledge, sir. It would be a mutually exclusive problem because those people could not be known as Communists, and if an outsider was called into those meetings, they would be exposed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know of any instance where a candidate or one who had been selected by the Political Affairs Committee to be a candidate had ever personally appeared before the Political Affairs Committee?

Mr. BLODGETT. Only Mr. Luther Morris, who was a member of the Communist Party and who was running for office; also John Bittman who was also running for office.

Mr. JACKSON. Were they running as Communists?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir. They were not. Morris as a Democrat crossfiled in the IPP, and John Bittman was running as a Democrat crossfiled in the IPP, and they are interested in any other than Communist Party members who were candidates to take part in the affairs of the committee.

Mr. VELDE. What office were these two gentlemen running for?

Mr. BLODGETT. Luther Morris was running for Congress, 6th District, and Mr. Bittman was running for State assembly.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Do I understand the Robert L. Condon whom you have named in your testimony to be the Robert L. Condon who is now serving in the House of Representatives in Congress?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. This meeting that you have referred to where you allege that he was present was in the year of 1948?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, as I recall, early 1948.

Mr. MOULDER. And during the spring period of that year?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Probably during the month of April, according to your best recollection?

Mr. BLODGETT. Somewhere in that area.

Mr. MOULDER. The meeting was held at whose home?

Mr. BLODGETT. Home of Gordon Williams.

Mr. MOULDER. And at what address is that?

Mr. BLODGETT. I don't recall the address.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give the approximate location of the home?

Mr. BLODGETT. I could identify the home, the area.

Mr. MOULDER. Was it here in San Francisco?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, it was in east Oakland, the hills in east Oakland.

Mr. MOULDER. You don't know——

Mr. BLODGETT. Oakland has a section——

Mr. MOULDER. Did you ever attend any other meetings there?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. You can't give us the address or the street where the home is located?

Mr. BLODGETT. I could determine it, I suppose. I could determine that address. I cannot give it to you now because I do not have it.

Mr. MOULDER. Approximately how many people were present there at that meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. If it were a full meeting, probably as many as 12 or 15 people.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall who was present when you arrived?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you describe in what part of the house you held your meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. The meeting was held in the living room of the house.

Mr. MOULDER. In the living room of the house?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Was the house a 2-story house, 1-story house, or frame house, brick, or what kind of a house?

Mr. BLODGETT. It was a frame house, an older home that they had done a very nice job of remodeling on; I remember there was a very beautiful living room, large fireplace; they were still in the process of doing over a part of the rest of the house at the time we were meeting there; entrances from up above, came down the road up above——

Mr. MOULDER. About what time was it during the evening or during the daytime this meeting was held?

Mr. BLODGETT. This is an evening meeting.

Mr. MOULDER. Approximately what time was it when you arrived?

Mr. BLODGETT. I would say approximately 8 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. MOULDER. Who notified you of this particular meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. Mr. Lehman.

Mr. MOULDER. Orally, by telephone, or how?

Mr. BLODGETT. Orally.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you go over there by yourself, or did you go with someone else?

Mr. BLODGETT. As I recall, Mr. Lehman drove us.

Mr. MOULDER. He, himself, drove you over there?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. When you arrived at the house you say you can't remember who was present in the room?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I cannot remember who those people were at that meeting that were present as of the moment I walked in the door; I cannot recall.

Mr. MOULDER. Was Mrs. Williams there?

Mr. BLODGETT. I do not recall that.

Mr. MOULDER. Gordon Williams was married, was he?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. You don't remember whether or not she at any time came into the room or out of the room?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I do not recall.

Mr. MOULDER. You say that Robert L. Condon was at that time a candidate himself for some public office. Do you recall what office?

Mr. BLODGETT. State Assembly of California.

Mr. MOULDER. In what county was that?

Mr. BLODGETT. Contra Costa County.

Mr. MOULDER. This meeting wasn't held in that county?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; it was held in the house—

Mr. MOULDER. As I recall your testimony, you say it was a special meeting where they invited some other people from some other county to this meeting in the Williams home?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. In connection with the candidacy for the office of Congress?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Who was the candidate for Congress at that time? George P. Miller?

Mr. BLODGETT. George P. Miller.

Mr. MOULDER. And one of the main purposes of the meeting was then to decide whether or not there would be a candidate proposed and supported by yourself and other Communist Party members against the candidacy of George Miller, is that so?

Mr. BLODGETT. George P. Miller, yes.

Mr. MOULDER. While you were going over there with this chairman—you mentioned his name a moment ago, that took you over in the car—what was his name?

Mr. BLODGETT. Lloyd Lehman.

Mr. MOULDER. Did he discuss with you any special invitations that were sent out to other people that evening for this meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; he did not.

Mr. MOULDER. At the meeting I believe you stated a moment ago that the apparent purpose of Mr. Condon's presence there was to try,

as attorney, to persuade you and others not to oppose the candidacy of George P. Miller?

Mr. BLODGETT. I don't recall that that was his purpose, stated purpose, in being at the meeting, no. I say, as I recall, that was the position he took at that meeting.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, that was the only subject which he discussed while he was present at the meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, I think that was the only subject of the meeting.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you intend to indicate by your testimony that by his presence there at that meeting for that particular purpose and on that occasion that he would be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I don't make any such inference. All I can say is that I have never known of a non-Communist in a meeting of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party. This is simply circumstantial.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't get that answer.

Mr. BLODGETT. I said I never knew of a non-Communist in attendance at a Communist Party closed meeting.

Mr. SCHERER. This was a meeting of one of the public affairs committees?

Mr. BLODGETT. Political Affairs Committee.

Mr. SCHERER. The kind that you—

Mr. MOULDER. May I pursue with my questions, please?

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry.

Mr. MOULDER. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio. Do you know of your own knowledge, your own personal knowledge, of anything which would show or prove or indicate that Robert L. Condon was a Communist at that time?

Mr. BLODGETT. Would show, prove, or indicate?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; I would say yes, to definitely show whether or not he was a Communist. You have testified about your being very active in the Communist Party affairs over a long period of time. During all of those years and during that period had you ever come in contact with Robert L. Condon in any manner before in connection with Communist Party affairs?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, not as such; only in my relationship with him as a reporter for the Daily People's World, which was pretty well known to be a Communist organ.

Mr. MOULDER. What do you mean by your relationship with him?

Mr. BLODGETT. In covering news stories.

Mr. MOULDER. You as a reporter?

Mr. BLODGETT. As a reporter, going to him as a member of the law firm of Edises, Treuhaft and Condon.

Mr. MOULDER. My question, though, is directed to you in this manner, for this purpose, to get your answer as to whether or not at any time before, during all Communist Party affairs, had you ever any evidence of coming in contact with Robert L. Condon as a Communist?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; I wouldn't be too likely, Mr. Moulder, because he lived in a different county.

Mr. MOULDER. I believe that is all at this time.

Mr. VELDE. I believe at this point we will declare a recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 2:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:40 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 2:55 p. m.)

(Representatives Harold H. Velde and Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room during the recess.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order. The chairman has been called away on official business. The subcommittee for the balance of this hearing will be constituted by Messrs. Scherer, Moulder, Doyle, with Jackson as acting chairman.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Blodgett, in response to a question in the earlier part of your testimony you stated that you were transferred from a club of the Communist Party, the Encinal Club, in November of 1948 to a club in Oakland. Am I correct about that?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your transfer to Oakland?

Mr. BLODGETT. I moved my household from Alameda to Oakland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, of the activities of that group or cell of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. My transfer was to the Anita Whitney Club of the Communist Party. It was located near east Oakland, Calif.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the chief activities of that club were during your membership in it?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, they were typical of the Communist Party club activities. It is just that it consisted of holding club meetings, cell meetings, conducting educationals on Marxist subjects, doing concentration work in the automobile industry; a Chevrolet plant was in east Oakland which we concentrated on as far as distributing leaflets, getting the party's point of view across.

I was becoming less and less active at this point. I was literature director of the club, was the squad leader of the club.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "squad leader"?

Mr. BLODGETT. Clubs were broken into small groups, 5, 6, 7 people, to try to reduce the inner party contacts to a minimum of preparation for an underground, illegal party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that first begin to be the practice?

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, that practice, as I recall, commenced in 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any particular incident or occurrence which brought about that decision in the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; I don't think it was precipitated by any one incident. It was precipitated by the general attack, successful attack, on the party, the trials of the top Communist leaders, the activities of committees such as this, which meant that the party was trying to tighten its security measures, which were always something of a farce to me because it was perfectly apparent to me they meant nothing and were simply deluding—and I think very, very deceitfully—a large number of recruits in the party who were assured that the party would protect them and keep their identity as Communists confidential, and could do this, when actually most of us who held any leadership position in the party realized that this was a farce, but with the exception of the squads—the objective there, of course, was to have units which would still function, even if the club as such couldn't

meet, even if the club as such—a larger group could not conduct and carry on the work of the party.

The more responsible members and disciplined members of the club executives were elected as head squad leaders, and they each were responsible for a small group of rank and file members as far as notification, handling meetings, and they conducted the cell as you would a miniature club of the Communist Party. Notifications were then possible by word of mouth of meetings, and that eliminated completely telephone notification of meetings and so on, reduced successfully inner party contact.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is important that the witness give his cooperation on this question. There apparently is some confusion or could well be confusion as to George P. Miller, and the Representative of Congress from Alameda County representing the 8th District, and the fact that there is a George P. Miller, Jr. of Martinez, Calif., who is the State chairman of the State Democratic Party in California, and I think it important at this point, as long as I now have the information, that the record speak whatever the fact is, if the witness knows.

Do you know, Mr. Blodgett, George P. Miller, the Representative in Congress from the 8th District in Alameda County, is not the George P. Miller who was the State chairman of the Democratic Party in California, is he?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, they are two different people. George P. Miller—I knew the name George Miller, Jr., not George P. Miller, Jr. George Miller, Jr. is the man from Martinez who was the State senator, and I understand that he is State Democratic central committee chairman.

George P. Miller, Congressman, is an entirely different person.

Mr. MOULDER. It wasn't the George Miller referred to in your testimony awhile ago?

Mr. BLODGETT. I think I referred to both of them.

Mr. DOYLE. Now that that is cleared up, may I take a minute or two at this point, before we drop the matter of Representative Condon. He is not here in person, and it would seem to me that perhaps as long as I have a question or two in mind as to what the facts may be, that the record should speak the facts, whatever they are, in addition to the facts that have been brought out.

I want to state this, however, in asking these questions, for fear that I might as a California Congressman, member of the Democratic Party, be charged later on with trying to defend a man who may or may not be a member of the Communist Party. I will say he is not as far as I know, but in asking these few questions of the witness I want the record to speak very clearly, I am not undertaking to defend him if he is a member of the Communist Party.

I merely want the record to speak whatever the facts are. But may I ask, therefore, Mr. Blodgett, your further cooperation in helping the record speak whatever the facts are in answer to these 2 or 3 questions that I want to ask of you.

You have stated in answers to the questions by my colleague, Mr. Moulder, from Missouri, that in your testimony you did not mean to

infer that Representative Condon was a Communist, didn't you? I understood you to say in answer to him that you did not mean to infer by anything you said that Congressman Condon was known to you to be a Communist.

Mr. BLODGETT. Well, I think that by the nature of my testimony that inference is there. You said that it does not prove Mr. Condon is a Communist. It certainly does not do that. I said it is within the realm of possibility that a non-Communist could be at that meeting, although to my knowledge it was unprecedented.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, what other similar meetings had you ever attended where a bunch of candidates were present who were running for the State assembly, and they were discussing candidates for the assembly or for Congress? What other meeting of this Political Affairs Committee did you ever attend where candidates were present for the assembly?

Mr. JACKSON. Does the gentleman refer to non-Communist candidates?

Mr. DOYLE. I refer to any candidates.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you understand the question?

Mr. BLODGETT. I think so. If I understand the question, I said earlier in testimony that the only candidates, that is, who ran as other than Communist Party candidates who were at political affairs committee meetings at which I was in attendance were Luther Morris and John Bittman. I have never attended a meeting of the Political Affairs Committee of Alameda County of the Communist Party at which other candidates were present.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. BLODGETT. Except in the case of Mr. Condon, who actually was a candidate. I wouldn't say that what I inferred or what flows from my understanding of the composition of the political affairs committee and attendance at the political affairs committee would ipso facto prove that Mr. Condon was a Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. I am trying to avoid, believe me, being technical. I am not trying to cross-examine you, Mr. Blodgett; that is not my purpose, but being a lawyer myself it is hard to get out of phrasing my questions as a lawyer might in cross-examination. I am trying to avoid that because all I want is the facts, because Mr. Condon is not here, and I think he is entitled to have the record speak whatever it may be fully.

You don't know whether or not Mr. Condon was invited to be present to discuss the candidacy of Congressman Miller, do you?

He might have been invited to be present, and you never have known of it and yet not be a member of the Communist Party. He could have been, in other words. You didn't shape up the invitations to that meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. You had no control over who was to be present at that meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You had no knowledge in advance who was invited to that meeting?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Or why they were invited?

Now, as I recall it, I think you testified that you thought that some of the law partners or associates of Mr. Condon were members of the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. BLODGETT. I stated that they were present at several meetings of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party and that those meetings were closed meetings of the members of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Was the attendance at these meetings limited to members of the Political Affairs Committee?

Mr. BLODGETT. The Political Affairs Committee did not have a set membership. It was a fluid membership. It was not a policymaking body. It was a body to implement policy, to carry out so that at any one meeting that committee would have a different set of individuals with the exception of the chairman of the committee and the officials of the Communist Party. Then would come under discussion who would be present at those meetings, so it did not have a regularly constituted membership.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, in your duties as reporter for the Daily People's World I think you indicated that you frequently got news from the law office of which Mr. Condon was a member; is that correct?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. You frequently dealt with his partners, both of whom you said frequently attended the political affairs committee meetings?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And that was over a period of about 2 years?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. During that 2 years of dealing with Mr. Condon's law partners you never learned that he was a member of the Communist Party; did you?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. And yet you spoke with him frequently and dealt with him frequently. You dealt with his law partners frequently?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Right in the same office?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You never had anyone in authority tell you he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. In the two years and a half that you dealt with him?

Mr. BLODGETT. No one told me that Robert L. Condon was a member of the Communist Party; that is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you said that it was the practice of the Communist Party to discipline their members who differed with their policy, to discipline them severely. You related an occasion when some woman was being disciplined; isn't that correct?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; that is correct. First of all, there would have to have been a policy or decision made by the body of the party which was violated or not carried out by a member before that discipline would be invoked.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, I don't know where—of course from the actions of the Communist Party, they are well known to you, not to me, but I did note that you said that Mr. Condon opposed the Communist Party putting in any opposition to Congressman Miller, George Miller of the Eighth District, for Congress, and he spoke against it,

and yet he was outvoted, apparently. Was he in any way criticized for that action or that attitude by the Communist authorities afterward?

Mr. BLODGETT. I have no direct knowledge whether he was or was not criticized for taking that position.

Mr. DOYLE. You would have known of it; wouldn't you?

Mr. BLODGETT. No; not necessarily.

Mr. DOYLE. You stayed as reporter of the Daily People's World about a year after that?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. You never heard of any discipline or any criticism of Mr. Condon taking that position?

Mr. BLODGETT. I do not recall any such—it was quite possible that he was criticized.

Mr. DOYLE. I think I am not quite clear, you correct me—but I think you indicated, didn't you, that Mr. Condon had defended two known Communists?

Mr. BLODGETT. I didn't mean to infer anything by that whatsoever. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. I was afraid that your relating of the fact that he had represented two Communists as lawyer might infer that because he did that he might be taken to be a Communist, and of course we members of the legal profession have a duty to represent any man.

Mr. BLODGETT. I appreciate that fully.

Mr. DOYLE. That is the American way of life, thank God.

On that particular suit—and I only mention this particular suit because you mentioned it—I want the record to speak whatever you know about the record in that case. That was the case, was it not, where 2 men whom you say were Communists—and I never met the men, know nothing about them—were cleared. The case, where they were found guilty in the lower court, involved a suit to test the constitutionality of the sound ordinance; didn't it?

Mr. BLODGETT. As I recall, that was exactly what the substance of the case was.

Mr. DOYLE. The High Court found those 2 men innocent?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. So that when Mr. Condon represented these men professionally, while he lost in the lower court, he won in the High Court?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And I presume the High Court was right in its understanding of the law.

Mr. BLODGETT. I think they were; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I did make a note here, as you spoke and gave us the facts, that at some meeting that Mrs. Williams came; Mrs. Williams attended, and she is not a member of the Political Affairs Committee. Now, she may have been a member of the Communist Party. I don't remember what your testimony was, but I did note that you said she was not a member of the committee, and yet she attended the meetings, and that would indicate to me that at least at one meeting you attended there was a person present who was not a member of the Political Affairs Committee. Do you remember that?

Mr. BODGETT. Yes; it was a meeting held at the Williams' home.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; but she was not a member of the political affairs committee, you said, and yet you said she attended the meeting.

Mr. BLODGETT. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. I am only trying to get the basic facts.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you yield to a question, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No; not yet, please. Let me finish my questioning.

Mr. BLODGETT. I might have one point there, if I may, Mr. Doyle. Of course as I said, membership in the Political Affairs Committee was not a set thing; it was not duly constituted membership, either elected or appointed. It was flexible. A person could attend a meeting only once in his life.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. Well, I am sure we don't want to convict any person by association of any crime.

I think, Mr. Chairman, while that is all the questions I have right on that point, I do have 2 or 3 other questions of the witness that I believe are important, and I marked them. They are in connection with his testimony this morning, and may I say again, for fear I will be misunderstood by some—because I am a Member of Congress and hope to be for several years yet—but I know I will be misunderstood because I have questioned this witness rather carefully to bring out more facts. I want the record to show that I am not trying to defend a man that is known to me as subversive or as a member of the Communist Party, but I am interested in having the record speak because he is not here to speak for himself.

Now, let me have this 1 minute, Mr. Chairman.

I notice, Mr. Blodgett, in this very fine book you gave us this morning, Midwest Student Victory Assembly, that on page 11 thereof—and you said this morning that Mr. Wendell Willkie, Harold Stassen, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Ed Thye, the former Governor of Minnesota, had endorsed this student victory assembly—and I see they have, and I want to just read one sentence from each of their endorsements and then ask you how in the world you got these. You didn't state that this morning. For instance, Mr. Wendell Willkie said, "Keep up the good works. Kindest regards."

Harold E. Stassen, ex-Governor of Minnesota, said, "I commend you highly for your program of victory student conference"; and Eleanor Roosevelt said, "I am glad to hear the student victory assembly at Carleton College is holding a convention"; and Ed Thye said, while he was governor, "I agree we need to start developing now the kind of leadership necessary to win the peace."

How did you get from those four patriotic, distinguished Americans those commitments approving that assembly?

Mr. BLODGETT. The best I can recall, Mr. Doyle, it was done by correspondence. Of course I described the letterhead that we had been able to concoct by getting the sponsorship of the student body presidents of various colleges, universities. The letter was directed to these people, among others, asking them to speak, stating the supposed aims and objectives of the victory assembly, and when they replied that they were unable to make a commitment to appear there as speaker, we came back and asked them would they then please, since we were deprived of their presence as speakers, send a message to the victory assembly that could be read to the delegates and help

give the assembly a successful finish, and of course they had no way of knowing the Young Communist League had organized it.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't they inquire, any of them? Didn't they question who was sponsoring this assembly?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir; not to my knowledge. There were no questions raised as to who the sponsor was. They knew who the sponsor was; the names of the sponsors were on the literature.

Mr. DOYLE. The reason I bring that out, Mr. Chairman, is just to show that even before the committee was in existence almost, prominent, distinguished Americans were being misled by reason of the fact that they didn't investigate who they were dealing with.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Blodgett, Mr. Doyle asked you about Mrs. Williams' presence at one of the meetings of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party. I understand that particular meeting was held in the Williams home; was it not?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. And Mrs. Williams, while she was not a member of the Political Affairs Committee, was a Communist. Did I understand your testimony to be that?

Mr. BLODGETT. Only by inference. Now, you say that might raise a question of guilt by association, but a meeting was held in their home. She was president of the closed meeting of the Communist Party. I never attended a meeting of the club of the Communist Party, never saw her party membership card, but she was present at a closed meeting of the Communist Party. That is all I said.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry. I go back to the first part of your testimony in which you pointed out so clearly that the meetings of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party were the most secret meetings that you attended; didn't you say that?

Mr. BLODGETT. That is true.

Mr. SCHERER. The greatest amount of security was placed upon those meetings?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SCHERER. And they naturally then were confined to members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. To the best of my knowledge they were.

Mr. JACKSON. During Mr. Doyle's remarks he mentioned that Mr. Condon was not here. I think it would be apropos at this time to read into the record the provision which is made in the rules of procedure of the committee for redress by any person who feels that he or she has been adversely affected by testimony, and I will read from the rules of procedure:

10. THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY A HEARING

(a) Where practicable, any person named in a public hearing before the committee or any subcommittee as subversive, Fascist, Communist, or affiliated with one or more subversive-front organizations who has not been previously so named shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, be notified by registered letter to the address last known to the committee of such fact, including (1) a statement that he has been so named; (2) the date and place of said hearing; (3) the name of person who so testified; (4) the name of the subversive, Fascist, Communist, or front organization with which he has been identified; and (5) copy of the printed rules of procedure of the committee.

(b) Any person so notified who believes that his character or reputation has been adversely affected or to whom has been imputed subversive activity may, within 15 days after receipt of said notice (1) communicate with the counsel of the committee and/or (2) request to appear at his own expense in person before the committee or any subcommittee thereof in public session and give testimony in denial or affirmation relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

(c) Any such person testifying under the provisions of (b) (2) above shall be accorded the same privileges as any other witness appearing before the committee and may be questioned concerning any matter relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

MR. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I have one question?

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

MR. MOULDER. Along with Mr. Doyle, my colleague, I wish to say that I personally have never met Mr. Condon, even though he is a member of Congress as I am, and I am sure that all members of this committee are equally anxious to expose communism and communistic activity wherever it may exist, but we are also just as anxious, of course, to get the true facts in connection with such accusations or inferences.

I want to compliment you upon what I observe to be your honesty and the sincerity of your testimony.

However, I recall a few moments ago when the question was asked about Mrs. Williams, I believe, when I was interrogating you, you stated that you didn't see Mrs. Williams at the Williams home at the meeting you referred to.

MR. BLODGETT. I do not recall her being at that meeting. We held several meetings at the Williams home. I do recall her being present at the other meetings.

MR. MOULDER. I see. That was at another meeting?

MR. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

MR. MOULDER. I see. When did you sever your relations or affiliation with the Communist Party?

MR. BLODGETT. When I left California in January of 1950.

MR. MOULDER. When you came to California?

MR. BLODGETT. When I left California.

MR. MOULDER. In January of 1950. Referring again to Mr. Condon, was he a candidate for election to Congress—that was 1952, wasn't it—or do you know?

MR. BLODGETT. I believe that is true. I have no—

MR. MOULDER. Do you know whether or not Robert L. Condon knew that the political affairs committee meeting was a closed Communist Party meeting, the meeting which was held at the Williams house?

MR. BLODGETT. I have no way of knowing what he knew; no.

MR. MOULDER. You do not know?

MR. BLODGETT. I do not know whether he knew.

MR. MOULDER. You don't know whether he knew that or not?

MR. BLODGETT. No.

MR. MOULDER. That is all.

MR. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee, please, who were the principal leaders in the new club of the Communist Party to which you were assigned in Oakland, the Anita Whitney Club?

MR. BLODGETT. The club chairman was a Mr. Carl Hanson; Mrs. Ann Yanish, Y-a-n-i-s-h, educational chairman of the club; a Richard Younce, Y-o-u-n-c-e, was treasurer of the club. I was literature director of the club at that time. Those are the principal officers of the club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, the names of the other members of the club that you can recall?

Mr. BLODGETT. Nat Yanish was a member of the club; Bill Danzig, D-a-n-z-i-g.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know the occupations of any of these individuals? If you do, I wish you would state them, please.

Mr. BLODGETT. I do not recall the occupations of Carl Hanson; Ann Yanish was a housewife; Dick Younce I do not recall; Nat Yanish was at one time that I knew advertising manager for the Daily People's World. I do not know Bill Danzig's occupation. He was Jewish IWO secretary, East Bay; Mrs. Evalyn Hanson, H-a-n-s-o-n, housewife; Mrs. Gertrude Warwick; Mr. Art Wolstenholme had a little cleaner shop in East Oakland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please?

Mr. BLODGETT. W-o-l-s-t-e-n-h-o-l-m-e; his wife, Beckie Wolstenholme; Robert Black, he was in the printing trades; Gladys Black, his wife; Mrs. Eleanor Smith, housewife; Leila Thompson; William Reich, R-e-i-c-h, who was editor of some farm publication the name of which I do not recall; a Joe Eisler, E-i-s-l-e-r. I do not know his occupation. His wife, Marjorie Eisler; and an Edith Sharpe, S-h-a-r-p-e. I do not know her occupation.

Those are the names of the Anita Whitney Club members that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to take you back in your testimony for just a moment to the labor school which you attended under the GI bill of rights. What was the name of the head of that school?

Mr. BLODGETT. The head of the labor school was a Mr. David Jenkins; educational director was Mr. Holland Roberts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you identify either or both of those persons definitely as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLODGETT. I believe I—

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to clarify the testimony regarding those two people.

Mr. BLODGETT. I believe I identified Dr. Holland Roberts as a member of the party, but I can't place the other party.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your identification?

Mr. BLODGETT. Again attendance at a meeting, closed party meeting, in the home of Adam Lapin, associate editor of the Daily People's World. It was a meeting of instructors of the Marxist Institute which was conducted late in 1949. Dr. Roberts—American history was one of the subject matters of the course, and he was present at the meeting, helped in preparation of outlines and materials for the conduct of those classes. The State educational director of the Communist Party was present as well as others who were teachers in the Marxist Institute.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have previously identified David Jenkins as having attended the meeting that you referred to, have you not?

Mr. BLODGETT. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not?

Mr. BLODGETT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge on the subject of his Communist Party membership?

Mr. BLODGETT. No direct knowledge. I have never attended a Communist Party meeting as such with David Jenkins.

MR. TAVENNER. You have testified in connection with your work on the People's World that you attended these various meetings of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party and that from time to time when problems in union matters were involved, that persons from those unions were present. I want to enlarge upon that and ask you whether you can recall any specific instances when this political affairs committee took action regarding any strictly union matters, if you recall any such thing as that having happened.

MR. BLODGETT. I am having a little difficulty with the term "strictly union matter," counsel. All of the meetings of the Political Affairs Committee I attended dealt in one way or another with the method in which the unions in which we had some influence or control would fit into a particular campaign.

Now, this may or may not be construed to be a strictly union matter. It was usually a political matter, matter of getting a union to support a resolution, support a campaign, support the Independent Progressive Party with funds, with volunteers. It might be a matter of asking local 6 of the warehousemen to provide pickets to man a Civil Rights Congress picket line, generally matters of that nature. Of course, in the formation of the Alameda County Joint Labor Committee, which was the key in the successful Oakland city council election, the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party played a very major role in directing the members of the committee who were also officials of the union on how to effect unity with the A. F. of L., how to conduct the affairs of that joint labor committee, and what that committee should do, and they were instructed by the Political Affairs Committee just how to conduct themselves in the affairs of the joint labor committee, and of course Kathleen Griffin was the secretary of that joint labor committee and took direction from the Political Affairs Committee of the party.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you identified all those who attended the political affairs committee meetings of the Communist Party who were representatives of labor?

MR. BLODGETT. Yes, sir; I believe I have.

MR. TAVENNER. Can you identify any other persons in the field of labor who were active as Communist Party members, irrespective of their attendance or nonattendance upon this committee?

MR. BLODGETT. No officials, union officials; that is, I cannot state under oath that other officials other than those I named were in attendance at a Communist Party meeting with me.

MR. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

MR. MOULDER. At this point in the proceedings, due to the fact that from some sources there has been criticism of this committee and its functions concerning organized labor, I feel it is proper at this time to make this statement, especially in view of what I believe to be the functions, the objectives of this committee.

First, I want to say as to myself that I am sure that no person could honestly criticize my voting record in Congress affecting the rights of organized labor. My services on this Committee of Un-American Activities have never been prejudicial or harmful to labor; on the contrary, this committee has tried at all times to expose Communist activities and to consistently assist labor to free its organizations of Communist control and domination and because communism, in my

opinion, is one of the most dangerous enemies of a labor union and their bargaining power, and Communist control would ultimately, in my opinion, destroy the functions of labor unions and the great benefits now enjoyed by members of labor unions in America as we know them. And this is clearly shown by the fact that free and independent labor unions are not tolerated in the Soviet Union. Realizing this to be true, I would say almost 100 percent of all organized labor is bitterly opposed to communism, and therefore I want to reiterate that the Committee on Un-American Activities has and does render a great service to labor unions when it exposes Communist control or influence in its organizations, and I also believe that the rank and file membership should take an active interest in such action as may be necessary to see to it that no Communist or Communist-controlled person is ever elected to an office or position of influence in the labor unions, and I am quite sure that the other members of this committee concur in this statement that I have made in that respect.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I join in that statement and say I heartily concur.

But at this point may I also add that I saw in the paper yesterday or day before a statement by some person who claimed to be speaking for some branch of organized labor, stating that this hearing now was planned to be in conflict with negotiations down in Honolulu involving some sugar organization, negotiations with organized labor.

In order that the record may be straight and honest, may I state that the gentleman that made that statement is absolutely in error for the fact is that these hearings that we are in this week here in San Francisco were arranged and agreed to and specifically provided for before the 5th of August 1953 at Washington; secondly, the first subpoena for a witness at this hearing was dated, I am told by our staff, on November 3, 1953, so whatever the gentleman stated—claiming to represent some labor union—as to this hearing deliberately being set in order to interfere with union negotiations purportedly going on in Honolulu at this time—that the gentleman is simply all wet. I want the record to show what the fact is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Louis Gonick, G-o-n-i-c-k?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes; I was acquainted with him. I can't state that he was a member of the Communist Party, however. I knew him as a friend acquaintance, at local 6 of the CIO Warehousemen's Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. You testified with respect to John Morgan, have you?

Mr. BLODGETT. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Donald McLeod?

Mr. BLODGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had testified as to the circumstances which led up to your interest in the Communist Party and your joining the Communist Party. The committee is interested in knowing the circumstances under which you withdrew from the Communist Party. Will you tell the committee, please, when you withdrew, if you did, and what were the circumstances?

Mr. BLODGETT. I decided to leave the Communist Party in the late summer of 1949. I actually left the Communist Party when I left

California in January of 1950. The reasons for my disaffection from the Communist Party are many. There was no single flash of disaffection. It was a cumulative thing over the 3½ years, approximately, that I became acquainted with the Communist Party in action.

When I first joined the Communist Party in 1943, in April, I was a Communist by intellectual conviction. I was convinced that the Communist Party was the last and best hope for the world; it was an answer to all of the problems confronting society; that it was the vanguard party of history; that its philosophy was without a loophole; that its methodology and historical perspective raised it above anything that had previously been developed by the mind of man.

I had a very romantic notion about the coming of this great millennium, the paradise on earth, heaven on earth—that is the promise of communism to the potential recruit—end of all war and poverty, end of man's inhumanity to man.

This is the promise that was held out to the recruit, and as I say, I was a Communist because I read books and studied, and I was convinced intellectually. However, I was not a Communist by practice until after the war, until I joined the party in California. Then I found that the practice of the party was antithetical to the promise that it held out to the future; it could not indeed achieve that, that it was in practice the opposite.

I related briefly in previous testimony some of the problems that were confronting me as a reporter for the Daily People's World, problems that went deep into the question of personal integrity and honesty. It did not take long for this disillusionment to set in. It did take me a while to get out because the party does have a very strong hold on its people. The party will tell members, especially someone who has been an open member, that they cannot escape from the party, that society will not accept them again as respectable members of society.

I have put down some of my thoughts on paper on this whole general subject, Mr. Counsel. I know it is not the policy of the committee to allow statements to be read, but that statement in writing that I have prepared pretty well covers the whole story of my leaving the party and my feeling about the party today.

The question of loyalty—this doesn't bother a Communist because loyalty is equated in class; class structure is based on Marxism. You are loyal to the working class, which becomes the group assigning the Communist theory. He cannot be loyal to an entity such as America or the United States and its Government and still be a good Communist. The two are mutually exclusive under the setup which the Communist himself will acknowledge, based on their theory that governments are instituted for domination of one class over another.

In the Soviet Union the working class, according to the Communist, has a power. "My loyalty is to the working class first, and then my loyalty must be to the Soviet Union—this is the worker's motherland."

The Communists do not face this question squarely. They refuse to. They rationalize it. They say, "We are loyal to the best interests of the American people, although the American people seem to have rather a basic disagreement with that. But ultimately that is the only truth that the Communists themselves have; they must acknowledge it; loyalty is loyalty to class. The working class has taken power

in the Soviet Union; loyalty is first to the Soviet Union. America is under the control of the capitalist class, and it follows from their own theory that they cannot be a Communist and also be loyal Americans."

Atheism—I think this was the starting point as far as I was concerned, my own personal experience, that had to do with the commission of the main sin that any of us commit, those of Christian faith—the sin of pride, the feeling that Man can be sufficient unto himself, that he can do without a Supreme Being, that in fact a Supreme Being does not exist. This is not only the road to communism; this is the road to all secularisms, and secular communism is the religion to me of secularism, of denying the existence of God and the subsequent desecration, moral debasement, that must ensue.

This is our hope and our salvation. I mean this very strongly. I once rejected a God that I did not know, and I rejected a church that I knew nothing about because I had only immature understanding of God and the church. I have corrected this. And secularism, no matter what its form, will lead to communism. Atheism is one of the things, the stumbling blocks, that helped propel me out of the party.

There are many, many other reasons that I could go on and spend hours and hours and point by point, example by example, on why it became so apparent that I could not stay in the Communist Party, no matter what the consequences would be; I would have to get out. I could not live, I could not raise my family. I certainly could not maintain a family.

Actually I was told by the Communists when they had an indication that I was leaving—my first step was to resign from the *Daily People's World* in October of 1949. I was told I was not open-faced, that I was not completely honest with the Communists. I did not tell them the reason I was leaving, and I was leaving California to break all my ties with communism. They blamed it on my wife and told me I should divorce my wife, that the party comes first, and that is another basic principle of communism, that the party is first; the party is worshiped. They don't have a God; they don't believe in God. They are atheists, but they do make a substitute god of the party, make a substitute parent of the party, a slavish insubordination to this concept of the partyist worship.

Although they do not believe in the Great Man theory of history, they do worship Joseph Stalin and worship Lenin; its adulation is something that is completely foreign to the basic spiritual foundations of our country.

I don't know if that begins to answer. I left the party, as I say, when I left California. I actually took a transfer with me in the form of a \$1 bill with a serial number on it. That was the method of transferring at the time. I never used that transfer, and I reestablished my life in Chicago and am trying to start over again, and I found that the main hold that the party has on people is absolutely groundless. This is more true day after day, that employers are not vindictive. They are not punishing people because they have left the party and renounced their former beliefs and associates. I found that this committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are not what the party pictures them to be, and I hope, I hope from the very depths of my being, that others can see their way clear to recognize that they

cannot build a life in the Communist Party, the kind of life that means nothing but sordidness and children who are distorted, who are abused, children who are destined to lead unhappy lives, and I plead with those of my former associates whom I have absolutely no hatred for—I have no antipathy at all, except for what they stand for and what they are doing.

They can follow, and they can get out, and there is no reason why they shouldn't absolutely, none whatsoever, and there are so many reasons why they should, so many reasons.

I don't know if there are other—there are many, many things that could be said on this subject, and I don't want to bore the committee. I would very strongly urge that the committee recognize something—I don't want to be presumptuous about this; I don't want you to think that I am being a smart aleck to tell the committee what it should do or shouldn't do, but this is not just a criminal conspiracy of people; these are people who are committed; they are people who have a religion, a belief that they are doing things on the basis of those beliefs, and ideas and beliefs are the wellsprings of movements historically.

You can't defeat them before a congressional committee. You can't defeat them in courts of law. You can't defeat them in jails. The hard-core Communists who feed on a diet of underground activity and jails and courts become hardened persons. You will find, reading Marxist theory and reading Lenin, that he says that you cannot have a successful prorevolutionary leader unless they have gone through this sort of thing, been steeled by struggle.

Being anti-Communist is not enough. We have to be for something, and we cannot fall into the trap of secularism because this, to me, is the basis of the whole problem, and it starts in the childhood. The point of greatest importance in the development of a person is the high-school and college level. I don't have statistics, but I am sure that most recruiting is done at the college level, and who is recruited? That young person who has developed a social conscience; the Communists are looking for people like that. That young person who is serious-minded, who is interested in the problems of the world and doing something about them—they are the material that the Communists take and develop. The skillful Communist recruiter can make such a picture for this person of this glittering future, he can show them exactly how to go about creating; he can prove to them, after he has gotten them receptive, that the people of the Soviet Union and China are marching toward this glorious future. He can do all these things with those receptive young minds, and if those young people do not have a firm foundation of belief in God and in their church, the Communists will succeed with those people.

There are none of my acquaintances at Carleton College—and the story of Carleton College is a very interesting one—there are none of my acquaintances who evidenced the same type of social conscience and perplexity about life and the meaning of life and a wish to do something about it to create this better world—but there were none of those people who had a sure belief in God and tied themselves to the church who were recruited by us. We could not recruit them.

We have to make that first step, and the committee can't do this. They can provide the material, case studies; they can synthesize it and analyze it and summarize it in such a form that could be really useful to college presidents, administrators, and high-school principals. Give them the kind of material that will make them realize that this natural radicalism of youth, these natural yearnings and urges, must be channeled properly or the Communists will take those young people, and will never defeat them by being anti-Communist because young people, as you know, are rejecting an adult world, are not affected by prohibitions. Prohibition did not stop alcoholism; prohibitions will not stop young people from entertaining these ideas that are the opposite of the adult world. The committee can do this; they can do it with other organizations. I know they have been; I know they have been doing it with labor. They can tell them how to spot these people, to stop them from their recruiting activities. The Communists will have to renew their membership; they have to get new recruits. This is a necessity, and that is where to cut them off; that is where to cut them off.

As you can tell, I think, from my testimony, I feel very strongly on this, and I want to enlist myself when and wherever I can in this fight.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Blodgett, I believe you said that you had a prepared statement. If you care to file that with the committee, and following the rules of procedure of the committee, upon committee vote it will be included in the conclusion of your testimony in addition to the remarks which you have made respecting your decision to leave the party and the reasons therefor and the suggestions which you have made.

Mr. BLODGETT. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to thank Mr. Blodgett very, very much for this very informative and inspiring cooperation on his part. It is simply magnificent.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Blodgett, on behalf of the committee, since my tenure on the committee, which has been relatively short compared with some of the other members, I have never heard finer testimony nor a finer summation of what communism does and the emotional and physical experience passing through it.

The committee is very grateful to you for your cooperation. It is a difficult ordeal, perhaps as difficult an ordeal as any human being is called upon to undertake. What you have had to say relative to the American business community and its relationship to those who have seen fit and seen it as their American duty to break with the Communist Party is very true in the experience of the committee. There are very few cooperative witnesses today who have come forward with their stories in honesty and in sincerity and with that quality of trustworthiness of which the chairman spoke yesterday who have not been received back and given every assistance in social and political rehabilitation.

There is only one point which I should like to touch upon in conclusion relative to your summation, relative to the point you made. You made the statement that we must stand for something. It is my personal opinion that millions of Americans believe in standing for the Republic. They are standing for perhaps the greatest order of things that was ever created; the Republic was founded on a belief in God; the Constitution was born out of what Winston Churchill called the blood, sweat, and tears of generations of loyal Americans standing for human dignity and for self-determination.

I believe that in standing for that that this committee, that the courts of the land, that the Supreme Court—in making its findings on the Smith Act—have been taking a positive position in favor of something. I don't think that we have any fundamental disagreement on that score.

Again may I say on behalf of all the members of the committee how deeply we appreciate your splendid cooperation, and we wish you Godspeed.

Mr. BLODGETT. Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

The committee will take a 10-minute recess.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 4:15 p. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 4:21 p. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Call your next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lloyd Lehman, will you come forward, please?

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear in the testimony you are about to give to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LLOYD LEHMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, RAYMOND MARSH

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. LEHMAN. My name is Lloyd Lehman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. MARSH. Certainly. My name is Raymond Marsh, attorney at law. My office address is 976 B Street, Hayward, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state for the committee, Mr. Lehman, when and where you were born?

Mr. LEHMAN. Could you finish with the photographers first, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was born in Hollister, Calif., April 11, 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation, Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman and counsel, I am going to refuse to answer questions that have to do with my occupation, that have to

do with my associations, or that have to do with my beliefs, and I have a number of reasons for refusing to answer those questions, and I will state them now.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Lehman, you do decline to answer as to your occupation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I decline to answer all the categories that I have just mentioned, including occupation.

The first reason is because this committee is practicing McCarthyism and is trying to substitute a Red issue for the issue of the income of the farmers and the working people. The second reason that I refuse to answer these questions is that this is a trial by slander. We are faced with witnesses, no possibility of cross-examination, and caught in a condition where it is impossible for the truth to come forward.

The third reason is that this is an indictment by suspicion with the stable of stool pigeons that you have to draw on who can say anything they want, distort facts to their own use, and create a type of suspicion that makes it tantamount to an indictment as far as the people are concerned.

The fourth reason is that this committee practices conviction by accusation. It is simple to understand that, that people are fired the day after they are accused, and that is tantamount to conviction by accusation.

The fifth reason, that this committee functions on the principle that war is inevitable and does everything it can with these illegal unconstitutional type of—I should say, this debasement of the legal process in this country—to bring forward stool pigeons——

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask you, what is a stool pigeon?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to answer the question that was asked me. I haven't finished answering the first question. I wish that I would not be interrupted until I finish, please.

Mr. JACKSON. Quite obviously you have not finished answering the question. However, there is a question pending from a member of the committee. If that could be answered, it would be appreciated by the Chair.

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I will keep it in mind until after I finish what I am presently involved in answering.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask the chairman to direct the witness to answer the question asked him by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. JACKSON. Actually there is a question pending, Mr. Moulder, and if the gentleman would withdraw it——

Mr. MOULDER. I will withdraw the question at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. In order that we may expedite the many reasons why the witness is refusing to answer.

(At this point Mr. Lehman conferred with Mr. Marsh.)

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Lehman.

(By order of the chairman and subcommittee, certain remarks of the witness were ordered stricken from the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. The next ground that I stand on for refusing is on the first amendment of the Constitution which guarantees a citizen's right to his political beliefs and associations, and I think that the type of question propounded here is properly refused of answer on that grounds, despite court decisions to the contrary, and I think it is time that that was challenged again, if necessary, in the courts.

I also refuse to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment, which holds that I do not have to bear witness against myself. That is all.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that the answer to the question of where he lives?

Mr. JACKSON. No, I believe that was the answer to the question as to what his occupation was.

That was a declination to answer the question as to his occupation. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lehman, I recall especially what you said about not being confronted by witnesses and inferences drawn from statements. Let me ask you a direct question. The witness who just preceded you on the stand was Mr. Charles David Blodgett. He testified under oath that you, as chairman of the Alameda County Communist Party gave him directions and instructions when to attend the meetings of the Communist Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party off and on over a period of 2½ years. Was he telling the truth or not? You now have an opportunity to meet those things face to face.

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, in taking the opportunity to meet those things face to face, I would appreciate if this committee would provide the possibility of my counsel cross-examining such a witness. And as far as my answering the question is concerned, I stand on my rights on the fifth amendment not to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate you, is that the ground you are relying on?

(At this point Mr. Lehman conferred with Mr. Marsh.)

Mr. LEHMAN. My counsel advises me that in regards to the fifth amendment that it is available to the innocent as well as the guilty.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair would like to state that if the witness is purely concerned about having the previous witness cross-examined, the best way that that could be accomplished is by, at this time, denying the validity or the truth of the witness' statements, in which case it is quite likely that the matter would be referred to the Attorney General of the United States seeking a perjury complaint, and the full process of law will then be available to the witness for examination and cross-examination.

Mr. LEHMAN. In other words, if I will crawl on my belly like he did, you will let me cross-examine him?

Mr. JACKSON. I don't know how you crawl.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, what was the name of the witness referred to?

Mr. TAVENNER. Charles David Blodgett, the previous witness.

Mr. JACKSON. I was merely telling the method by which that cross-examination, of which he appears so enamored, could be arranged. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you recruit Mr. Blodgett into the Communist Party in San Francisco or the bay area?

(At this point Mr. Lehman conferred with Mr. Marsh.)

Mr. LEHMAN. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a functionary of the Communist Party in Alameda County?

Mr. LEHMAN. I claim the same grounds for refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEHMAN. I claim the same grounds for refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEHMAN. I claim the same grounds for refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Just one question. A few moments ago you used the words "stool pigeon." What do you understand that term to ordinarily mean?

Mr. LEHMAN. The disgusting exhibit that was put on here by the witness that preceded me will define it sufficiently for my—for your and my use.

Mr. MOULDER. Ordinarily a stool pigeon is one who betrays a co-conspirator, those who were jointly engaged in the commission of some crime, wrong-doing, and when one betrays to other people what they are jointly about to do, then he is called a stool pigeon, is that the way you used the term?

Mr. LEHMAN. There are lots of definitions of stool pigeon.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you finished, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

Will the record show at this point that the subpoena covering the previous witness, Mr. Charles David Blodgett, will be extended indefinitely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mary Pieper.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear in the testimony you are about to give to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. PIEPER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MARY PIEPER, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, JAMES C. PURCELL

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. PIEPER. Mrs. Mary Pieper.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel, Mrs. Pieper?

Mrs. PIEPER. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. PIEPER. My name is James C. Purcell. My office is at 990 Geary Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Mrs. Pieper?

Mrs. PIEPER. At 2490 Encinal Drive in Walnut Creek.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mr. PIEPER. I was born in Philadelphia.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to San Francisco?

Mr. PURCELL. I think you are in error, counsel; she lives not in San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in the bay area which you described.

(At this point Mrs. Pieper conferred with Mr. Purcell.)

Mr. PURCELL. The witness desires to exercise her rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was directed at the witness. She is perfectly capable of replying, I am sure.

Mrs. PIEPER. Well, I want to decline as an American citizen to answer these questions, and I intend to stand upon the fifth amendment, which states that no person need be forced to testify against themselves.

Mr. JACKSON. Mrs. Pieper, you want to decline. Do you so decline to answer?

Mrs. PIEPER. I do so decline.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask counsel to identify himself for the record?

Mr. JACKSON. Counsel has identified himself.

Mr. PURCELL. I did, sir. My name is Purcell.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain that you intend to claim the immunity of the fifth amendment in answering the question which I just proposed to you, that of when you came to the State of California.

Mrs. PIEPER. Yes, I wish to so claim that immunity.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that you direct the witness to answer that question because I can't possibly see how answering that question could incriminate her in any way. It is obviously improper use of the fifth amendment.

(At this point Mrs. Pieper conferred with Mr. Purcell.)

Mr. JACKSON. I think it is a matter of proper identification. It is desirable, and the witness is directed to answer the question.

Mrs. PIEPER. Well, I still claim the privilege of standing on my constitutional rights.

Mr. JACKSON. And decline to answer the question?

Mrs. PIEPER. And so decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are contending then, as I understand it, in good faith that to answer that question of when you came to the State of California might tend to incriminate you, is that the basis—

Mrs. PIEPER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the basis upon which you refuse?

Mrs. PIEPER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the hearing room during the period that Mr. Charles David Blodgett testified?

Mrs. PIEPER. I was here during a portion of that testimony, not all of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you here during the portion of the testimony this afternoon when Mr. Blodgett described the activities of the Communist Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PIEPER. I was in the room and heard him mention that committee. I am not, of course, positive that I heard all his mention of it since I was not here all of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me repeat this portion of it to you in the event you may not have heard it: Mr. Blodgett testified that you were chairman of the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party during a period possibly of as much as 2½ years, from 1947 to the neighborhood of 1949. Were you the chairman of that group at any time during that period?

Mrs. PIEPER. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PIEPER. I again decline to answer the question on the same grounds as before, namely the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. If you were not a member of the Communist Party, would you so state?

Mrs. PIEPER. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Just one question, Mr. Chairman: Would you refer to Mr. Blodgett as a stool pigeon?

(At this point Mrs. Pieper conferred with Mr. Purcell.)

Mrs. PIEPER. I don't want to pass on the testimony of any other witness in this particular hearing.

Mr. MOULDER. You heard the witness testify preceding your testimony. He said he was a stool pigeon. I merely want to comment that he isn't denying the testimony of Mr. Blodgett; he is merely complaining about it because he has, so he says, been a stool pigeon against him.

That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert Treuhaft.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear in the testimony you are about to give to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TREUHAFT. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. TREUHAFT

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. TREUHAFT. My name is Robert E. Treuhaft, T-r-e-u-h-a-f-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. TREUHAFT. Just a moment, please. Lawyers have this problem, you know.

Mr. JACKSON. We don't want audible comments. The Chair has heard several in the immediate vicinity and would appreciate it if no audible comment is made during the course of testimony.

Mr. TREUHAFT. Mr. Tavenner, I am obliged to appear as a witness before this committee—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please, sir?

Mr. TREUHART. I am answering the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Treuhart, will you please answer the question, sir, following which you will be given every opportunity to explain——

Mr. TREUHART. I am answering the question.

Mr. JACKSON. I fail to hear an answer to the question. I heard you begin to explain that you were obliged to appear as a witness, which is quite an obvious fact.

Mr. TREUHART. I was asked whether I had counsel.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. TREUHART. I am answering that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. His answer is not responsive.

Mr. TREUHART. May I be permitted to answer the question?

Mr. JACKSON. I wish you would answer the question.

Mr. TREUHART. I am obliged to appear before this committee without assistance of counsel, Mr. Tavenner, because of the fact that the repressive activities of this committee have made it impossible for me to secure the assistance of attorneys of my choice. This is a serious charge for a lawyer to make. I am compelled, however, to make it because the state of affairs that I have found to exist in this regard is truly shocking.

A month ago I received a subpoena calling for my appearance before this committee. My law partner and I have been, for many years, and are now, general counsel for the East Bay Division of Warehouse Union Local 6, ILWU, a labor organization which is one of the principal targets under attack by this committee. In fact, I am sure this was well known to the committee's investigators, and I cannot down the suspicion that my representation of this union had something to do with the fact that my law partner and I are the only East Bay lawyers subpoenaed before the committee at these hearings so far as I know.

I readily agreed to represent four East Bay members of this union as their attorney, who likewise were subpoenaed, despite the fact that I, myself, had been subpoenaed as a witness.

Upon receipt of my subpoena I immediately began to make diligent efforts to secure counsel to represent me. I compiled a list of the 7 leading East Bay lawyers whom I would want to represent me because of their known ability in their profession and because all of them had, from time to time, shown themselves to be champions of the right of advocacy. All had a sound understanding of due process of law and of the other constitutional rights and immunities which are daily trampled upon by this committee.

And I would like to say that in making these references to certain members of this committee I do not wish to reflect upon Congress as a whole, as some members of this committee have, by making accusations by inference against one of their own members.

I have respect for elected Members of Congress, and I would not attack them by imputation or inference if I didn't know the facts.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Treuhart, may I ask you at this point, sir, if you are reading a prepared or written statement?

Mr. TREUHART. I am referring to notes.

Mr. JACKSON. You are referring to notes?

Mr. TREUHART. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. May the Chair be furnished with a copy of his statement? Very well, proceed.

Mr. TREUHART. That statement was for the press.

Mr. JACKSON. I know; I now have it. That is freedom of the press.

Mr. TREUHART. The first lawyer, whom I will call lawyer No. 1, holds high office in the Alameda County Bar Association. When I first approached this lawyer, he told me that he could see no reason why he could not represent me. The next day, however, he informed me that he felt that he could not do so because of the controversial nature and the publicity attendant upon hearings before this committee and because of his position in the county bar association.

The second lawyer I consulted out of this list, lawyer No. 2, is a former judge who has an active practice on both sides of the bay. I discussed with him the position which I intended to take before this committee; that is, to uphold the Constitution and to rely upon the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution as they might apply to every question that this committee might put to me.

This attorney, who is highly placed in the bar, agreed fully with me in principle and stated that it was his opinion that my decision was sound and wise. He told me that he would like to represent me.

After conferring with his associate, however, he called me in again, and he said that he was very sorry that he could not because representing me with the attendant publicity or representing any witness before this committee would involve financial hardship. He said that he regretted very much to give me this answer because we have been on friendly terms. He said to me, although he is a well-established lawyer, and older than I am, "Why don't you find some older lawyer, someone who is in a better financial position, to take this risk?"

The third lawyer I went to see and offered a retainer to represent me before these hearings was an older lawyer, and he was a better financially established lawyer so far as I know. He formerly held high office in the American Bar Association, and he, too, has been a champion of the right of advocacy. He told me, "Try to find a younger lawyer. The activities before this committee would be too strenuous," he thought, the publicity would be harmful.

The fourth lawyer I went to is a leading criminal lawyer in the East Bay. We have been on very friendly terms, and he readily agreed to represent me without any hesitation at all. When I offered him a retainer, he said that he would not accept a retainer from a fellow lawyer. He took the subpoena, and we proceeded to discuss the position I was going to take, and he agreed with me fully that anybody who had represented unpopular causes as a lawyer, as I have, would face grave dangers in answering any questions put by this committee. Three days ago I—I consulted him 2 weeks ago—3 days ago, the day before—3 days before I was supposed to come here, he called me, and he told me that his partner had just returned from out of town and had learned that he had undertaken to represent me. He said that his partner represented a bank, and that his partner felt that the attendant publicity would be so harmful to them that he insisted that they could not represent a witness before this committee.

He told me this with very personal regret. He also expressed the view—his partner did—that any attorney who represented a witness before this committee might find himself in a position where he was persecuted by other governmental agencies, as was Vincent Hallinan, against whom reprisals were taken, because he had the courage and temerity to represent a client who, in some eyes, was considered unpopular.

Lawyer No. 5 is one of the most distinguished members of the bar of Contra Costa County. He has held high office in the bar association there, and he is a leading lawyer in every sense of the word. He has also been a fighter for the right of advocacy. He told me with very great regret that he had discussed with some of his corporate clients the advisability or his intention to represent a witness before this committee. These clients told him that they would consider it an unfriendly act if he were to represent a witness before this committee. He said that although he was well established, he had very high overhead and that he didn't want to subject his organization to the financial hardship and risk of losing clients that would be involved in representing anyone before this committee. I told him that I intended to take this matter up with the bar association and also to make a statement to this committee on my experiences in attempting to obtain counsel, and that I intended to keep the names of the individuals that I had consulted confidential. He said, "Bob, a fact is a fact. I feel rotten about telling you what I have to tell you, but a fact is a fact; you state the facts, and I authorize you to use my name and to give the reasons that I have given you."

This man had real courage.

Mr. SCHERER. He didn't appear, though, did he?

Mr. TREUHART. No; he authorized me to say that he couldn't appear because these slanderous accusations by committees like this made it dangerous financially.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the man you say had real courage?

Mr. TREUHART. Yes; he had real courage, and all of these lawyers that I named had real courage. I went to them because they were courageous. I am not condemning nor criticizing the lawyers. I am condemning this committee for trying its cases in the newspapers and over the radio. I am condemning this committee for depriving me of right to counsel by its slanderous attacks, attacks by inference, which even repel and revolt some of the Democratic members of this committee when they saw the performance that was put on today with respect to a Member of Congress.

Mr. SCHERER. That is your law partner?

Mr. TREUHART. Who is?

Mr. SCHERER. The man you referred to?

Mr. TREUHART. The man I am referring to is one of the leading lawyers in Contra Costa County. He is not any law partner of mine. He represents banking and industrial interests.

Mr. SCHERER. That wasn't the man I was referring to.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. Will the witness continue with his notes?

Mr. TREUHART. I also consulted a couple of other leading lawyers in the same category. These lawyers had reasons which I respect, special reasons which I respect, for not wanting to be in this particular position at this time.

However, their position was also connected with the fear of adverse publicity that would be attendant upon representing as counsel somebody before this committee.

Now, the canon of ethics of the American Bar Association, as I think Representative Moulder has referred to, states, and this is law for lawyers, that no lawyer shall, for reasons personal to himself, reject any cause because it is unpopular. All of the lawyers that I consulted did reject this cause for reasons personal to themselves, but for reasons created by the hysteria engendered by this committee in the public mind, the fear that anybody who appears before this committee is labeled as a spy or something subversive, and that the taint may rub off onto the lawyer.

In this bleak picture, there is, however, a ray of hope because courageous counsel have come forward to represent some of the witnesses here, and I must pay a tribute to them for so doing because I am sure they do it at the risk of personal financial hardship. They may lose clients. The National Lawyers' Guild has published a statement saying that it would furnish counsel to witnesses here who could not otherwise obtain counsel.

Why haven't I gone to these lawyers and said, "Represent me, too"? The reason is that I as a lawyer think it would be unfair to place an added burden upon these people who have come forward already courageously and made sacrifices. I don't want to place upon them any additional financial burden or danger by representing me before this committee, and I think the committee should know that one of the lawyers who did have the courage to come here and to agree to represent a client here was fired from the law firm that he is a member of two days ago because of his agreement to represent a client, a witness, before this committee.

I don't want to place that added burden on any of the lawyers who have already come forward to represent clients here. This whole situation is McCarthyism. President Truman recently described it as such. He said that it is the use of the big lie and the unfounded accusation against any citizen in the name of Americanism—in quotes—and security—in quotes. It is the use of the power of the demagogue who lives on untruth, and I am reading here, Mr. Jackson, because I am quoting, and I don't want to be inaccurate:

"It is the spread of fear," President Truman said, "and the destruction of faith at every level of our society. This horrible cancer," he said, "is eating at the vitals of America, and it can destroy the great edifice of freedom."

Mr. Truman went on to say that this situation should serve to alert the people to the terrible danger that our Nation and each citizen faces and urge his fellow countrymen to "be aroused and fight this evil at every level of our national life."

I am prepared to fight this evil at every level, and I intend to ask the State bar to look into a situation which I think is truly disgraceful, where lawyers with real courage and standing are afraid to come forward and represent clients before this committee. I think it is symptomatic that even Congressman Doyle—who in certain respects I differentiate from other members of this committee—had to be somewhat fearful and cover himself because he wanted to get at the truth of a witness that appeared to be lying and attempting to mislead

this committee. Perhaps Mr. Doyle will some day be called as a witness before McCarthy's committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well, and for those reasons you are not represented by counsel. I think the record should show at this time that the American Bar Association, acting through its house of delegates, has endorsed the work of this committee, and without objection the endorsement and resolution of the American Bar Association will be placed in the record at this point.

(The endorsement and resolution of the American Bar Association to be furnished is as follows:)

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES, AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ON FEBRUARY 25, 1952

* * * * *

RESOLUTION II

* * * * *

The congressional committees investigating communism, and in particular the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been attacked on the ground that they have engaged in smear campaigns and have invaded the constitutional rights of persons investigated. Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted during the period of time indicated by our study of the published testimony. We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects, and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved; moreover, the confidential communications between attorneys and clients have been fully respected.

It is the view of your committee that current attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee are unjustified. Whether deliberate or misguided, such unwarranted attacks result in reducing the effectiveness of that committee's great service to the American people.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness has also mentioned the National Lawyers' Guild and the brave fight they are putting up. Without objection I should like to have the citations on the National Lawyers' Guild written into the record at this point, and I believe that they are significant enough that they will stand repetition at this point.

Mr. DOYLE. What citation was it, Mr. Jackson? In what book?

Mr. JACKSON. In the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications published May 14, 1951.

Mr. DOYLE. By what governmental agency or authority?

Mr. JACKSON. By the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities and the California committee.

The chair has on several occasions requested the audience to refrain from demonstrations. It is to be hoped that the audience will cooperate in this matter. The Chair would not want to order the hearing room cleared at this late hour in the day. However, if it is found necessary to proper conduct of the hearings, the Chair will have no hesitation in so ordering the officers to clear the hearing room.

The National Lawyers' Guild was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities report of March 29, 1944, page 149. It was also cited as a Communist front which is "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party and its front organizations and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and

individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" in the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities Report on the National Lawyers Guild, H. Rept. No. 2123, September 21, 1950, originally released September 17, 1950.

There are several other citations which without objection I would like to have included in the record at this point.

(Citations of National Lawyers Guild from Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications of May 14, 1951, are as follows:)

1. Cited as a Communist front (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 149).

2. Cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, H. Rept. No. 3123, September 21, 1950, originally released September 17, 1950).

3. It "came into being early in 1937" and "on June 5, 1940, A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, resigned from the National Lawyers' Guild, charging that the leadership of the organization is not prepared 'to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party lines.'"

Cited by the committee as a "Communist front for attorneys" (California Committee on Un-American Activities, reports, 1943, p. 98; 1947, p. 48).

4. "The late Frank P. Walsh, Comptroller Joseph D. McGoldrick, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Hon. Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State; Nathan Margold, Solicitor to the Department of the Interior, and others have resigned from the organization with the ground that it is Communist-dominated" (New York City Council committee investigating the municipal civil-service commission).

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TREUHART. If representation of such persons is considered subversive—

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it your position that you would desire your appearance continued until you have an opportunity to consult other counsel?

Mr. TREUHART. I would desire to have my appearance continued until such time as the hysteria engendered by this committee has abated to such an extent that it is possible for me to have counsel of my choice and to such time as it is possible for me to have one of these advocates that I consulted represent me. The Constitution says that I am entitled to counsel of my choice, not counsel of your choice.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question is this: Are you asking this committee to postpone your appearance until you can obtain counsel?

Mr. TREUHART. Yes, and that postponement would have to await the time that this committee changes its rules so that it conforms with due process of law so that lawyers can appear here with dignity and without fear of reprisal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in light of that type of an answer, I will proceed with my questioning.

You referred to unfounded accusations that are made by people who appear before this committee. The committee at the present time is very much interested in ascertaining the facts regarding the operations of the Communist Party in the bay area. It has received testimony indicating that there was a group of high ranking members of the Communist Party who constituted a committee entitled the political affairs committee. Our information is that you may have some knowledge of that organization.

I am asking you to tell this committee, if you will, what you know about its operations.

Mr. TREUHART. Well, I have to disagree with your premise, Mr. Tavenner, that this committee is here for the purpose of investigating subversive activities because the committee has stated in its press releases that it is interested in harming people by exposing them as one thing or other. I would say that it is the object of this committee to get headlines, and that is why I am here, and that is why Bob Condon was so prominently mentioned here.

Mr. JACKSON. Until such time as the witness produces for the committee a statement that this committee is interested in harming people by exposure, and without objection, it will be stricken from the record as not a statement of fact, not based on any fact.

Mr. TREUHART. I will cite to this committee a statement that it gave to the San Francisco Examiner or one of the——

Mr. SCHERER. There is no question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Just produce the statement at some future date.

Mr. TREUHART. I will produce it now for you if you like.

Mr. JACKSON. Produce any statement which says that this committee is interested in harming people, and we will accept it for the record.

Mr. TREUHART. This committee has stated that it is not interested——

Mr. JACKSON. I am going back to your original statement. I should like to have the production of the article in question.

Mr. TREUHART. If you will give me 2 minutes, I will give it to you.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. SCHERER. Out of the Daily Worker?

Mr. TREUHART. Out of the San Francisco Examiner, not to be confused with the Daily Worker.

I believe I was asked a question about evidence of the purposes of this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. No, you were asked a question relative to a direct statement which you attributed to the press.

Mr. TREUHART. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us have——

Mr. TREUHART. I will read from the San Francisco Examiner.

Headline: "100 Top Bay Area Reds Face Exposure in Probe." It says—this is in quotes——

Mr. SCHERER. From whom?

Mr. TREUHART. The reporter here says that it is from a spokesman for the committee. It says of those people who are called as witnesses:

Thus identified, their Communist activities will be neutralized. They will become valueless to the party. In effect the committee hopes to leave them high and dry on the beach. The total result, it is hoped, will be to pull out communism by the roots in this area.

If that is a legislative purpose, Mr. Jackson, I can't——

Mr. JACKSON. That is hardly a statement of hurting persons. It may hurt them as far as the Communist Party is concerned, and it may very well.

Mr. TREUHART. It says "neutralize their effectiveness in this area," and what does that mean to someone who is working?

Mr. JACKSON. I would certainly say that one of the prime purposes of this committee is to neutralize the effectiveness of the Communist

Party, in this area and everywhere else. So far as that is concerned, that is a correct statement of fact.

Mr. TREUHART. If that is the fact, I might as well go home, because the purpose of this committee has to be legislative, and that is not a legislative purpose.

Mr. JACKSON. Stay around just a little bit, Mr. Treuhart, because counsel has some questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question to you was that you tell the committee what knowledge you have regarding the functioning of the committee to which I refer, the committee known as the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. TREUHART. I decline to answer any question that deals with associations, beliefs, ideas, rights guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution. I decline to answer any such question because of the fact that, as in the case of Mr. Condon, accusation is made by inference. Why should a person who is called here as a witness be called upon to clear himself when he doesn't have adequate means to bring witnesses in his behalf, can't even get a lawyer in some cases, and can't even cross-examine the witnesses who appear and spill names by the dozen.

Mr. SCHERER. Is Mr. Condon your law partner?

Mr. TREUHART. I am confident that one of the reasons I was called here was because some of the headline hunters here very well knew that he is a former law partner of mine. He is not a law partner at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. The principal reason you were called here, Mr. Treuhart, is because the committee has identification of you as a member of the Communist Party and felt that perhaps it was within your knowledge to be of help to the committee in disclosing the nature and the extent and the objectives of the Communist Party in the bay area. It has nothing to do with your law partner. You are here on your own.

Mr. TREUHART. I wouldn't dignify those accusations as testimony.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there a question pending?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, will you give us your own testimony as to the activities—

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute. He hasn't answered the question. He hasn't invoked any but the first amendment. I am going to ask the Chair to direct him to answer the question. Let us get the record on this straight, gentlemen.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe the witness said that Mr. Condon was a former law partner.

Mr. SCHERER. He hasn't answered Mr. Tavenner's question at all.

Mr. JACKSON. What question is pending?

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought he relied on the fifth amendment but I may be mistaken.

My question to the witness was to tell the committee what he knows of the activities of the group known as the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party in Alameda County; what he knows of the operations of that committee.

Mr. TREUHART. I decline to answer that question for the reasons given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are those reasons?

Mr. TREUHART. Right of association, danger of guilt by association, any lawyer who has represented Communists or persons otherwise identified with unpopular causes faces that danger. I rely on the rights granted me under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the witness will not discuss the matters which we are here to investigate, I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TREUHART. I decline to answer that question for the reason stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TREUHART. Same answer.

Mr. JACKSON. For the same reasons?

Mr. TREUHART. Yes, for the same reasons.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that all, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. The newspaper clipping you were reading from a moment ago, what is the date of that issue of that paper?

Mr. TREUHART. It came out the day after I got my subpoena. I don't have the date on it. I will be glad to leave the clipping with you. It is about November 4 or——

Mr. JACKSON. Is that all, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. May I make this clear to you: I think you misjudge—I am sure you do—why I questioned Mr. Blodgett. Just a minute ago you said that I questioned because he was lying or I felt he was. Now, that is not true. I did not feel that Mr. Blodgett was lying. I tried to make my position clear when I began questioning Mr. Blodgett that I wanted all the material facts which could be presented before the committee with reference to Mr. Condon who was identified as a member of the United States Congress, of which body this committee are all members, and while I realize that I was taking more time to question Mr. Blodgett as to the identity of Mr. Condon than we Members of Congress were taking on other individual names, I felt that the fact that he is a Member of Congress and is not here and not having been positively identified as a Communist by Mr. Blodgett, made it my duty as a Member of Congress to get whatever facts in addition to what Mr. Blodgett had testified to before the committee. So may I make it clear that you may have assumed that the reason I was questioning was because I questioned Mr. Blodgett's veracity. That is not a fact.

May I make that clear?

Mr. TREUHART. I want to compliment you, Mr. Doyle, for acting in a very lawyerlike way by refusing to accept guilt by inference and guilt by suspicion.

Mr. DOYLE. I am never going to do it if I can help myself, but——

Mr. TREUHART. I hope——

Mr. DOYLE. May I say this further, and this hasn't been brought out, Mr. Chairman, yet, and I think as long as this member of the

bar is criticizing the function of the committee, as he does, on basic grounds, that possibly it is right for me as a member of the bar also of the State of California to reply on the basis of grounds.

For instance, this committee is not a special committee. This committee is one of the permanent committees of your Congress and mine, and it operates under Public Law 601, passed in the 79th Congress, and I think it appropriate to read it for the benefit of everyone who has heard this discussion between us.

I read:

The Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized to make from time to time investigations of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated in foreign countries or of domestic origin and attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and in all other matters in relation thereto that would aid Congress for necessary or remedial legislation. The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House, or to the clerk of the House if the House is not in session, the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

I will not read the balance of it because it goes on into other detail.

Now, therefore, may I mention to you as a member of the bar also. I want to emphasize that I think every member of this committee feels as I do, that this committee had a very big and a very strenuous assignment, and some of us were on that committee without having sought appointment. We were placed there to do a job. That job is to ferret out the subversive people and organizations in our country.

Now, we are not interested in ferreting out people that may disagree on political philosophy, but we are interested in uncovering subversive people or subversive organizations, and there is no question, may I say, in my judgment but that the Communist Party in America—at least ever since the Duclos letter—has been subversive increasingly. That is, I think, in May 1945, and therefore no matter how I may question a witness to bring out the facts, may you and all others understand that I am just as anxious as any other member of the committee possibly could be to uncover the activities of any person in America who is subversive. But I do feel, as I said before, that my duty called me to get what material facts I could in the absence of a fellow Member of Congress. May I take one minute more, Mr. Chairman?

I hadn't mentioned this fact in this hearing before, but I feel this group probably is entitled, in view of the fact that my activity in questioning about Mr. Condon was called attention to, it may be later understood, as I anticipated it might when I questioned Mr. Blodgett, for political or other purposes.

I have just returned from Europe, Mr. Attorney. I was over there on an official trip of the United States Congress. Because I am on this committee and on the Committee of Armed Services, it was my privilege to interview certain intelligence people in Portugal, in Spain, in Italy, in France and Germany and Austria and Norway and other places. I inquired over there as to the functioning of the Communist Party in Europe, and I came back more convinced than ever that the Communist Party's subversive program in the United States has been, at least since the Duclos letter in April 1945, and now is part and parcel of the same world conspiracy on the part of the Soviet

Union to take over economic, political, and sole control of the world, if not by military, then by subversive activities. That is why I am serving on this committee.

One further statement. As Mr. Jackson, our acting chairman, has said, the American Bar Association passed resolutions of endorsement of the functioning of this committee. May I add, Mr. Jackson, that that was done after thorough investigation of the methods used by this committee.

Mr. TREUHART. Of course, yesterday the Young Democrats denounced it in the newspapers.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am sorry the Young Democrats, Inc., of San Francisco denounced it because they didn't know what they were doing in my book, and I am a Democrat, too, and proud of it. They could not speak officially for young Democrats of California.

Mr. TREUHART. Mr. Truman denounced it also.

Mr. DOYLE. Neither does he know exactly how we now function when he did it. I also criticize some of our procedures at times.

Mr. TREUHART. The Presbyterian Church has denounced it; the Methodist Church has denounced it.

Mr. JACKSON. The Communist Party has denounced it.

Mr. TREUHART. Right.

Mr. MOULDER. I don't recall that President Truman denounced this committee.

Mr. TREUHART. He defied it.

Mr. DOYLE. May I just finish my further statement very briefly?

Mr. TREUHART. He stood on the same Constitution that I stand on.

Mr. SCHERER. I agree with you.

Mr. DOYLE. I have this one further statement, Mr. Chairman. I know that this committee is maligned, is lied about in every possible way and will continue to be, but the great burden of the malignment and the falsehood and misrepresentation for the purpose of this committee stems from subversive propaganda and subversive organizations in this country. I know that. I am sure of it.

When the American Bar Association—and I stress this because you are an attorney also, as I am—when the American Bar Association thoroughly investigated the methods used by this committee and its functioning and passed that resolution unanimously about a year ago, I take it for granted that there is no reason in the world why any member of the California bar who really wants to follow his code of ethics need hesitate to appear before this committee and represent any client.

Mr. SCHERER. If he wants to.

Mr. DOYLE. If he wanted really to do so and follow his code of ethics which requires him to; and with that I am through, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREUHART. Mr. Doyle, you have been very courteous. As a fellow lawyer I would like to make just one statement about the Condon testimony. I listened rather attentively, and the only subversive activity that I heard attributed to Mr. Condon was his espousal of the candidacy of a fellow Democrat, George Miller.

Now, perhaps in the eyes of Mr. Jackson that is subversive, but I trust that in your eyes it is not.

Mr. JACKSON. No. As long as Mr. Jackson has been mentioned, let me say that the only subversive activity with which I am particu-

larly concerned is the case of anyone who has been identified as having been present at a closed meeting of the Communist Party, which is quite a different thing. That is subversive. This defense of acting as counsel on behalf of two Communists is certainly not subversive, and it is ridiculous to impute to me or to any Member of the Congress that we consider that to be subversive activity.

Mr. TREUHART. Your Bible is guilty by association, and you so try to impute guilt to him.

Mr. JACKSON. We are trying to impute nothing to him. He will be given every opportunity to affirm or deny what appeared in public testimony. The committee didn't say it. A witness placed him in a closed party meeting of the Communist Party.

Mr. TREUHART. Why should a Member of Congress have to come before this body in order to clear himself? He can go before his electorate.

Mr. JACKSON. He does not have to come before this body, and he is quite capable of making the decision——

Mr. TREUHART. I don't think he should dignify this body by coming before it.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

Will you call your next witness, and will the officers clear the hearing room?

Mr. TAVENNER. John Delgado.

Mr. JACKSON. That will include the balance of the subpoenaed witnesses inasmuch as this is the last witness we can take today.

(The hearing room was cleared at 5:25 p. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order. The chairman, with the permission of the other committee members, has made an exception in the case of several attorneys in the room who, I understand, may be appearing before the committee. For that reason and in order to observe the committee procedure, that exception has been made, and without objection. For the record, the Chair regrets the necessity for clearing the hearing room. However, on no less than 6 or 8 occasions the audience in the hearing room has been advised that any demonstration would result in that action. The committee has made every effort to accommodate the public here, and the hearing room will, of course, be open tomorrow for the appearance of the witnesses then.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I supplement your statement by saying this, that the disturbance manifestly did not come from the whole room. It came from a concentrated area in the rear of the room, evidently a planted group planned to disturb. I wouldn't want the record to indicate that it was general throughout the whole room.

Mr. JACKSON. No, it was necessary to exclude a great many people who took no part in the demonstration, and that is particularly regrettable.

Mr. Counsel, will you proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Delgado.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear in the testimony you are about to give to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DELGADO. Yes, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN DELGADO, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
JOSEPH LANDISMAN**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. DELGADO. John Delgado.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell your last name, please.

Mr. DELGADO. D-e-l-g-a-d-o.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. DELGADO. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. LANDISMAN. Joseph Landisman, member of the bar of the State of California; offices in Richmond, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Delgado?

Mr. DELGADO. I was born in Hilo, Hawaii, August 19, 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to California?

Mr. DELGADO. When I was a child; I guess I was around 18, I am just not sure; somewhere in there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. DELGADO. Truck driver.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information based on sworn testimony that you are in position to know of the operations of a group or committee of the Communist Party which has been referred to in testimony as the Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party. I would like for you to tell the committee all you know about the activities of that group.

Mr. DELGADO. I decline to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony that this group met from time to time in your home. The witness who made that statement under oath was Mr. Charles David Blodgett. Was he telling the truth about that or not?

(At this point Mr. Delgado conferred with Mr. Landisman.)

Mr. DELGADO. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the meetings take place at your home?

(At this point Mr. Delgado conferred with Mr. Landisman.)

Mr. DELGADO. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Blodgett?

(At this point Mr. Delgado conferred with Mr. Landisman.)

Mr. DELGADO. I decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DELGADO. Decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DELGADO. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused.

At this time the committee will stand in recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:38 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 9:30 a. m., Friday, December 4, 1953.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Herschel-----	3300, 3304
Alexander, Leon-----	3283
Ashe, Harold-----	3286
Attarian, Aram-----	3284
Attarian, Sally-----	3284
Barnes, Carroll-----	3297
Baroway, Leo-----	3288
Berle, A. A., Jr-----	3335
Bick, Barbara-----	3288
Bittman, John-----	3305, 3311
Black, Gladys-----	3317
Black, Robert-----	3317
Blacklock, Charles-----	3284, 3286
Blodgett, Charles David-----	3267,
3268-3324 (testimony), 3326, 3328, 3329, 3338, 3339,	3342
Bodkin, Wesley-----	3297, 3302-3304
Bowen, Mildred-----	3302, 3305
Boykin, Ernest-----	3285
Brown, Al-----	3284
Brown, Archie-----	3289
Brown, Cleophas-----	3302, 3303, 3305
Brudney, Goodman-----	3297, 3305
Caldwell, Bill-----	3276
Campbell, Will-----	3285
Canright, Marjorie-----	3288
Canright, Norman-----	3288
Carson, Jules-----	3282, 3287
Cerney, Isobel-----	3283
Chown, Paul-----	3298-3300, 3302, 3304
Churchill, Winston-----	3324
Claibourne, Ethel-----	3284
Claibourne, Sidney-----	3284
Coe, Lee-----	3288
Condon, Robert L-----	3302-3304, 3306-3308, 3310-3313, 3315, 3316, 3336-3340
Cook, Ernest-----	3285
Danzig, Bill-----	3317
Davis, Clarence-----	3283, 3284
Davis, Shelly-----	3284
Delgado, John-----	3298, 3305, 3341, 3342-3343 (testimony)
Devine, Lester J-----	3293, 3294
Duclos-----	3280, 3339
Dwinmell, Robert-----	3284
Edises, Bertram-----	3300-3303, 3305, 3308
Edises, Pele-----	3288
Edwards-----	3302
Edwards, George-----	3297, 3305
Eisler, Joe-----	3317
Eisler, Marjorie-----	3317
Elber, Irwin-----	3283
Evans, Jean-----	3274
Fagerhaugh, Ole-----	3297, 3304
Foster, William Z-----	3285, 3286
Franks, Frank-----	3285
Gilbert, Jane-----	3288

	Page
Gonick, Louis	3319
Green, Louis	3288
Green, Walter	3303
Griffin, Kathleen	3298, 3300-3303, 3305, 3318
Grossman, Hazel	3282, 3283
Hall, Ernest	3291, 3292
Hallinan, Vincent	3332
Hames, Lyn	3304
Hanson, Carl	3316, 3317
Hanson, Evalyn	3317
Hearn, Cleveland	3285, 3286
Hearn, Inez	3285
Heide, Paul	3297, 3300, 3302, 3304
Heide, Ruby	3297, 3304
Hill, Newton	3284
Hill, Pearl	3284
Hultgren, Ruth	3284
Hultgren, Wayne	3283, 3284
Izzard, Ralph	3288
Jenkins, David	3317
Johnson, Allen	3305
Johnson, Ralph	3305
Kelly, Ora	3284
Kelly, Mrs. Ora	3284
Kelly, Robert	3278
Kirkon, Walter	3285
Kramer, Harry	3288
Landisman, Joseph	3342-3343
Lapin, Adam	3283, 3288, 3317
Lapin, Eva	3288
Legard, Albert	3285
Lehman, Fanny	3284
Lehman, Lloyd	3283-3286, 3289, 3293, 3295, 3296, 3297, 3299, 3302, 3304, 3307, 3324-3327 (testimony)
LeSueur, Meridel	3271
Lewis, James	3285
Lewis, John L.	3275
Lewis, Veda	3285
Lima, Helen	3288
Mackie, Martin	3278
Maddox, Mrs.	3285
Margold, Nathan	3335
Marsh, Raymond	3324-3327
Martin, Sandra	3305
McGoldrick, Joseph D.	3335
McLeod, Don	3286
McLeod, Donald	3319
Melia, Carmen	3285
Melia, Joseph	3305
Miller, George	3303, 3311, 3312, 3340
Miller, George, Jr.	3304, 3310
Miller, George P.	3301, 3302, 3304, 3307, 3308, 3310
Morgan, John	3300, 3301, 3302, 3305, 3319
Morris, Luther	3285, 3302, 3305, 3311
Murdock, Steve	3288
Parker, Eugene	3285
Partridge, Sid	3288
Pecora, Ferdinand	3335
Pieper, Mary	3297, 3302, 3304, 3327-3329 (testimony)
Purcell, James C.	3327-3329
Reich, William	3317
Richmond, Al	3287, 3288
Roberson, Mason	3288
Roberts, Kenneth	3284
Roberts, Holland	3282, 3317

Page

Roberts, Vera	3284
Roosevelt, Eleanor	3272, 3314
Roosevelt, President	3274
Schachter, Mr	3271-3273
Schlipf, Paul	3297, 3304
Schneiderman, William	3289
Segure, Rose	3305
Selsam, Howard	3270
Sharpe, Edith	3317
Smith, Eleanor	3317
Smith, John	3285
Standish, Jack	3284
Standish, Ruth	3284
Stassen, Harold	3272, 3276, 3314
Strack, Celeste	3289
Terry, Joe	3285
Terry, Opal	3285
Thompson, Leila	3317
Thye, Ed	3314
Todd, Louise	3303, 3305
Treuhart, Robert E	3301-3303, 3305, 3308, 3329-3341 (testimony)
Truman, President	3333, 3340
Wallace, Henry	3290, 3301
Walsh, Frank P	3335
Ward, Doug	3288
Warwick, Gertrude	3317
Wheeler, Juanita	3288
Whitney, Anita	3309, 3316, 3317
Williams, Gordon	3299, 3301, 3302, 3305-3307, 3314
Williams, Mrs. Gordon	3307, 3313-3316
Williams, Joy	3299
Willkie, Wendell	3272, 3274, 3314
Wolstenholme, Art	3317
Wolstenholme, Beekie	3317
Yanish, Ann	3316, 3317
Yanish, Nat	3317
Younce, Dick	3317
Younce, Richard	3316
Young, Barney	3305
Young, Bernard	3297

ORGANIZATIONS

Alameda County Bar Association	3331
Alameda County CIO Council	3299
Alameda County Independent Progressive Party	3305
Alameda County Joint Labor Committee	3299, 3300, 3318
American Bar Association	3331, 3333, 3334, 3340
American Federation of Labor	3285, 3299, 3305, 3318
Army	3273
Bethlehem Shipyards	3284, 3285
California Labor School	3279-3284, 3287, 3299
California State Federation of Labor	3280
Carleton College	3268-3272, 3277, 3284, 3322
Carpenters Union, A. F. of L	3305
Civil Rights Congress	3292, 3293, 3300, 3301, 3304, 3318
Communist International	3289
Congress of Industrial Organizations	3285, 3298, 3299, 3304, 3305, 3319
Department of the Interior	3335
Federal Bureau of Investigation	3321
Federated Press	3289
Independent Progressive Party	3296, 3299, 3301, 3302, 3304, 3305, 3318
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 6, east bay division	3330
International Workers' Order	3317
Laborer's Union, A. F. of L	3284

	Page
McAllister College	3272
Midwest Student Victory Assembly	3273, 3275, 3276, 3314
National Lawyers' Guild	3333-3335
Navy	3268, 3278, 3279, 3283
Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party	3295,
3299, 3301, 3302, 3305, 3308, 3312, 3315, 3318, 3328, 3337, 3342	3299, 3305
Progressive Citizens of America	3272
St. Olaf College	3285
Steamfitters' Union, A. F. of L.	3301, 3305
Steelworkers' Union, CIO	3280
Tom Mooney Labor School	3305
United Electrical Workers Union	3305
United Electrical Workers Union, CIO	3274, 3276
United Nations	3289
United Press	3272, 3277
University of Minnesota	3273
United Service Organizations	3279, 3281
Veterans' Administration	3319
Warehousemen's Union, CIO	3297
Warehousemen's Union, Local 6	3268, 3269, 3271-3273, 3277-3279, 3283, 3284, 3315
Young Communist League	3340
Young Democrats	3340
Young Democrats, Inc., of San Francisco	

PUBLICATIONS

Daily People's World	3283, 3286-3290,
3292-3296, 3298, 3303, 3308, 3312, 3313, 3317, 3318, 3320, 3321	3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3336
Daily Worker	3289
Michigan Worker	3276
Minnesota Daily	3336
San Francisco Examiner	3273
Student Offensive	3295
Worker	



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 2009

FEB 6 1957

